DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 414 969 JC 980 041

AUTHOR	Knudson, Linda S.
TITLE	Team Leadership in Three Midwestern Community Colleges: The President's Cognitive Frame of Reference and its Relationship to Real versus Illusory Teams.
PUB DATE	1997-00-00
NOTE	244p.; Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Kansas. Summarized in conference paper, see JC980037.
PUB TYPE	Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC10 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Role; Case Studies; *Cognitive Style; College Administration; *College Presidents; Community Colleges; Comparative Analysis; Interviews; *Leadership Styles; *Management Teams; Teamwork; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Team Effectiveness

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted of presidents and management team members at three Midwestern community colleges to gather information on the effect of presidential style and the effectiveness of leadership teams. In-depth interviews were held with the three presidents and a total of 12 team members; data were collected on the colleges, the participants, and their jobs; and team meetings were observed. The study sought to classify the teams with respect to three basic functions: utilitarian, helping achieve a sense of rationality and maintain control; expressive, reinforcing a sense of connectedness; and cognitive, enlarging the intelligence of individual members to enable the team to act as a creative system. Information was also gathered on the presidents' cognitive frame of reference in terms of four types: bureaucratic, focusing on structure and organization; collegial, focusing on collective action and consensus; political, focusing on mobilizing resource and developing coalitions; and symbolic, focusing on interpreting institutional history and culture. The study found that all three teams were effective in that they performed activities in all three team functions, despite the fact that community colleges are generally bureaucratic and their presidents tend to be externally focused. The study also found that the presidents all used collegial frames of reference, which helps explain the effectiveness of the teams. Contains 74 references. Appendixes provide interview consent forms, forms for collecting demographic data, interview questions, a team observation checklist, and study coding schemes. (BCY)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 414 969

TEAM LEADERSHIP IN THREE MIDWESTERN COMMUNITY COLLEGES: THE PRESIDENT'S COGNITIVE FRAME OF REFERENCE AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO REAL VERSUS ILLUSORY TEAMS

By

Linda S. Knudson
B.A., Wichita State University, 1978
M.P.A., University of Kansas, 1990
Ed.D., University of Kansas, 1997

Johnson County Community College
12345 College Boulevard
Overland Park, KS 66210
(913) 469-2510
lknudson@johnco.cc.ks.us

JC 980041

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
LINDA S.
KNUDSON

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

© 1997
Linda S. Knudson

ABSTRACT

This multi-site case study examined the characteristics and composition of three presidential leadership teams in medium-size community colleges, including team member perception of the effectiveness of team activities, the presidents' cognitive frame of reference and its influence on the teams' functional domains, the teams' cognitive complexity, and the degree to which the team processes were complex and "real" versus simple and "illusory."

The literature review revealed minimal research on team leadership in academic settings, particularly in community colleges. The study was based on work by Bensimon and Neumann (1993), who examined presidential team leadership in colleges and universities and found that complex and "real" teams were most likely to be found in small, private four-year colleges. Community college teams were largely unexamined.

Qualitative research methods were employed to study teams in their naturalistic setting. Intensive interviews were conducted with three presidents and twelve team members who made up their teams. Demographic data were collected, and each team was observed on-site. Analyses of the data followed qualitative methodological techniques.

The research revealed that the three community college presidential teams functioned as complex, "real" teams according to the Bensimon and Neumann (1993) framework, despite the fact that community colleges have been historically bureaucratic and their presidents externally focused. In this study, the presidents played a critical role in building and maintaining complex teams, and the presidents' cognitive frames of reference influenced the teams' effectiveness. The importance of trust and mutual respect among team members, effective communication, and adequate time for meetings and team development emerged as themes that also influenced perceived effectiveness. There was a difference in the way team members and presidents viewed the most important functions of the leadership team. For team members, a fully functioning team meant high degrees of mutual respect, support, and caring; presidents valued different perspectives, receiving feedback, and creative problem solving.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation has been, in many respects, a team effort. I would like to thank the presidents and team members who graciously shared their time, knowledge, and experience with me in order to make this study possible. I have learned from them, and admire the hard work, commitment, and time that they have invested in making team leadership a reality at their institutions.

The members of my doctoral committee have guided me and provided emotional support during the dissertation process. I am especially grateful to Dr. Marilyn J. Amey, my major advisor, for serving as my Critic, Emotional Monitor, and Task Monitor during the writing of this dissertation. She has provided intellectual leadership throughout the doctoral program, and her insights, sense of humor, and encouragement are deeply appreciated. I would also like to thank Dr. Susan Twombly for her incisive comments and suggestions for editing this study, and Dr. Charles Carlsen for his overall support and encouragement of my educational goals.

Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends for supporting me, especially during the trying times. My children, Keri and Kyle, deserve special thanks for foregoing many activities so I could concentrate on my studies. My parents, Vernon and Mickey Burklund, and my sisters, Judy Reed and Janis Burklund, believed in me, encouraged me, and helped me through some difficult times. I am grateful for my friends, Denny and Margie Kurogi, for their long-time support and caring. Helen Burnstad deserves special thanks for serving as my peer reviewer, and Amy Fugate for keeping me laughing despite all the trials and tribulations. My teams at work--Sue Scheitzow and Janet Kempcke; Karen McDaniel, Cathie Peterson, and Margaret Willis--all helped me in more ways than they will ever know. Special thanks also for the inspiration, support, and encouragement given me by the colleagues and teammates who have gone before me in this process, especially Drs. Irene Mortenson Burnside, Pat Long, Jackie Snyder, Mary Lou Taylor, and Sally Winship.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE I

ABSTRACT iii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS v

TABLE OF CONTENTS vii

LIST OF TABLES x

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION 1

- Background of the Study 1
- Purpose of the Study 10
- Definition of Terms 13
- Significance of the Study 16

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 19

- Literature on Community Colleges 20
  - Community College Governance 24
- Literature on Community College Presidential Leadership 27
- Literature on Teams and Team Leadership 33
  - Team Leadership in Business and Industry 33
  - Team Leadership in Higher Education 39
  - Team Leadership Effectiveness 43
- Literature on Cognitive Frames of Reference 48
- Summary 52

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 54

- Qualitative Research Design 54
- Role of the Researcher 57
- Validity and Reliability 58
- Pilot Study 60
- Research Sample 61
- Data Collection 63

3

Data Analyses 65
    Demographic Data 66
    Individual Interviews 66
    Team Observation 69
Limitations of the Study 70

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS OF THE STUDY 72

Demographic Data 74
Case Studies 78
    River City Community College 79
        Team Milieu 79
        President's Cognitive Frame Analysis 82
        Team Functional Domain Analysis 87
        Perceptions of Team Leadership and its Effectiveness 89
        Cognitive Complexity Analysis 94
        The President's Team as a Reflection of the Model . 99

    Great Plains Community College 102
        Team Milieu 102
        President's Cognitive Frame Analysis 108
        Team Functional Domain Analysis 113
        Perceptions of Team Leadership and its Effectiveness 115
        Cognitive Complexity Analysis 120
        The President's Team as a Reflection of the Model 126

    Heartland Community College 129
        Team Milieu 129
        President's Cognitive Frame Analysis 133
        Team Functional Domain Analysis 137
        Perceptions of Team Leadership and its Effectiveness 139
        Cognitive Complexity Analysis 144
        The President's Team as a Reflection of the Model 150

CHAPTER FIVE: CROSS-SITE ANALYSIS 153

Demographic Data and the Teams' Milieux 153

Presidents' Cognitive Frame(s) 159
Team Functional Domains 162

Perceptions of Team Leadership and its Effectiveness 164
    Time 165
    Trust 167
    Communication 168
    Functional Domains and Team Effectiveness 169
The Cognitive Complexity of Teams 171
    Core Cognitive Roles 172
    Supporting Cognitive Roles 175
Team Observations 178
Assessment of the Teams as a Reflection of the Model 181
Summary 181

CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS 184

Overview of the Study 184
Summary of the Research Findings 187
    Composition of Community College Teams 187
    Community College Presidents' Cognitive Frames
        of Reference 188
    Community College Team Functional Domains 190
    Community College Team Leadership Effectiveness 190
    Community College Team Complexity 191
Conclusions 194
Implications for Practice 201
Implications for Research 204
Summary 206

REFERENCES 207

APPENDIX A: Consent Forms 214

APPENDIX B: Demographic Forms 219

APPENDIX C: Interview Protocols 222

APPENDIX D: Team Observation Checklist 227

APPENDIX E: Coding Schemes 231

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Demographic Data - Institutions 75

Table 2: Demographic Data - Presidents 76

Table 3: Demographic Data - Team Members 77

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

The idea of team leadership in higher education is not new. The collegial institution, as it was conceived early in the history of higher education, was a non-hierarchical "community of scholars" who were actively involved in the governance of their institutions. In the collegial institution, leadership emerges from "committee and deliberative group activities and autonomous academic activities" (Bergquist, 1993, pg. 17). The hallmarks of a collegium as described by Birnbaum (1988, pg. 86) include an emphasis on "consensus, shared power, common commitments and aspirations, and leadership that emphasizes consultation and collective responsibilities."

It is rare for the true collegial institution as described by Bergquist and Birnbaum to exist today, due to the increasing size, complexity and bureaucratization of academic institutions coupled with the conflict and change now affecting academic life (Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1973). What remains, however, is a strong collegial culture based on the mixed traditions of German research universities, British universities, and the American colonial colleges (Bergquist, 1993). These mixed traditions have produced a culture in which faculty are oriented toward their disciplines, value independence, autonomy, and academic freedom, are suspicious of academic administration, and assume that power resides in faculty-controlled governance processes. The 1981 AAUP Wingspread Conference on Governance, which focused on the crisis of shared authority, identified the following four issues as relative to the erosion of the faculty's role in governance: 1) the bureaucratic power of the administration has increased; 2) the development of large, multi-campus systems and the intrusion of governors and legislatures have moved decision making authority away from the campus; 3) the emergence of collective bargaining, which developed in response to the erosion of shared authority, has not replaced the stronger role of faculty voice in institutional decision making; and 4) there is a serious gap of leadership in the area of shared authority (Spitzberg, 1982). Many of these same issues are still facing universities and community colleges today (Baker, 1992; Bing and Dye, 1992; Duncan and Harlacher, 1991; Hahn, 1995; Rice and Austin, 1991; and Vaughan, 1994).

In contrast, from the administrative viewpoint, Blyn and Zoerner (1982, pg. 21) write that managing a beleaguered organization is as "frustrating, inefficient, and ineffectual as pushing on a string." They outline four elements of the academic subculture that exert a perverse influence on academic managers: 1) institutional objectives are vague and performance criteria for managers are ambiguous; 2) the twin values of collegiality and shared governance impose limits on managers' authority, which results in their inability to operate directly and openly; 3) most faculty disdain administrative work and have a patronizing attitude toward those who perform it; and 4) despite the national attention in the private and public sectors on the need to increase productivity, academic subcultural values are anti-productivity. As a result, if academic managers were productive and achieved desired results with a minimum of effort, they would not be respected. This situation prevents most academic administrators from providing bold, effective leadership. However, the institution's chief executive officer is expected to provide this type of leadership in an environment that is increasingly hostile to closely-held power.

In concert, one of the dominant leadership styles of the past in the literature of business, government, and education is the heroic style--a single individual who holds most of the organization's power and who has been entrusted to solve all of the organization's problems (Guskin and Bassis, 1985). The heroic leader in academia is representative of the powerful chancellors and presidents of the past, who may not have been dictatorial or authoritarian but felt that it was the prerogative of the chief executive to make all of the key decisions. Heroic leaders typically did not delegate their authority, which alienated faculty and produced tensions with other administrators.

Today, the nation's chief executives are operating in an increasingly complex, turbulent, and uncertain world. Technology, the economy, and the labor force are changing rapidly. Coupled with the knowledge explosion, leaders are faced with environments that are hard to analyze and understand. More decisions need to be made in less time for shorter and more numerous events (Cameron, 1991). The need for effective leadership in higher education was never greater, according to Hahn (1995). Although those in higher education "love to weigh our leaders in the balance and find them wanting" (pg. 14), Hahn asserts that those in academia need to consider their collective role in the successful governance of institutions, and take responsibility for creating conditions that find, support, and keep good leaders.

To gain a better understanding of the complex realities facing higher education today, leaders need the compound vision and talent of several people. The ideal manager of the future will not be the solitary hero, but a facilitator of collective mindwork--minds that think differently, problem solve differently, and differ in their unique capabilities (Bensimon and Neumann, 1993). In contrast to the solitary hero so common in organizational myth, Robert Reich (1987) calls for the team to be considered as the hero. The talent, energy, and commitment of a team, where the whole is greater than the sum of individual contributions, will provide the competitive advantage and innovation needed to succeed in today's environment. Due to the complex realities facing leaders today, leadership is beginning to be redefined in a collective form, as it occurs "among and through a group of people who think and act together" (Bensimon and Neumann, 1993, pg. 2).

Although the team idea has mushroomed throughout the manufacturing industry and is beginning to take hold in banking, insurance, and financial services, teams are still relatively rare in service industries (Hoerr, 1989). Self-managing teams appear to be the wave of the future, yet academia has been slow to seize the opportunity to empower its people through team leadership, as evidenced by the bureaucratic and hierarchical structure of most institutions. As a consequence, there is a paucity of literature on team leadership in higher education. However, there is a call for more collaborative methods of governance in the literature, and they are usually described as "participative decision making," "collaboration," "shared authority," "empowerment," or other collective terms. The Commission on the Future of Community Colleges concluded that a new model of executive leadership will be critical to the survival of the community colleges (AACJC, 1988). The Commission found that:

> Community college presidents increasingly will need to be coalition builders. No longer will the hierarchical model of the industrial period suffice. Moving beyond day-to-day operations, future community college presidents...must be able

> to collaborate, bring together various constituencies, build consensus, and encourage others within the college community as well. (pg. 41)

Gareth Morgan (1986) asserts that hierarchy and horizontal divisions within an organization get in the way of "double-loop learning," the ability of an organization to adjust operating norms to fit the environment. He calls for a "bottom up" or participative approach to planning to provide the multiple viewpoints needed to solve complex problems. Kim Cameron (1991, pg. 294-5) calls for "ad hoc structures, collateral or parallel processes, or matrix arrangements" and "consensus-building group decision processes" to deal with the turbulent postindustrial environment. Kotler and Murphy (1991) advise top administrators to involve other groups, such as faculty and the alumni, in the process of goal formation to help gain their support. Rice and Austin (1991) found, in their study of exemplary colleges, that in every college with high faculty morale and satisfaction there was strong, participatory leadership. In addition, faculty at the high morale colleges reported consensual decision making, and sharing of authority by those in positions of influence. Below, Morrissey, and Acomb (1990) conclude that there seems to be a general agreement among many authors that participative decision making enhances organizational effectiveness.

The current literature in higher education governance (e.g., Acebo, 1994; Bensimon and Neumann, 1993; Bing and Dye, 1992; Fryer, 1989; Guskin and Bassis, 1985; Rice and Austin, 1991; and Weber and Karman, 1989) points to team leadership as an emerging paradigm. When authors speak of team leadership, they are often referring to the presidential team. The president's team can be as small as two people, as when the president and vice president work together in a collaborative relationship (Birnbaum, 1992), or much larger, as in the case of the administrative team or cabinet.

An alternate perspective on team leadership is the cognitive team described by Neumann (1991). The cognitive team is usually the president's team, but other administrative or multi-constituent teams could function in the cognitive model as well. The cognitive team is a "sense-making system patterned after the human mind and capable of perceiving, thinking, learning, and learning to learn" (pg. 487). In this model, the team constructs its own reality by virtue of a set of roles that team members play (see "Thinking Role" on pg. 14). The strength of the cognitive team is that members are likely to have a greater measure of success in a complex, turbulent environment than those who prefer to work alone, or those who ignore cognitive roles in building teams, or who develop teams with members who think alike.

Other possible team formats found in higher education include multi-constituent ad hoc committees, advisory committees, task forces, problem solving committees, research committees, planning teams, and single-constituent departmental, divisional, school, or college committees. The word "possible" is a caveat, as a group of people working together in pursuit of manager-defined goals is not a team, but a work group. What differentiates a team from a work group is the idea that team leadership is interactive, collaborative, and shared. Team agendas are not set by the leader, but are created and negotiated by the team. Team members are not merely advisors to the team leader, but empowered participants in institutional leadership. Finally, leadership is shared meaning; it is the creation of meaning as well as the discovery of meaning that others believe and value (Bensimon and Neumann, 1993).

According to Bassin (1988), teams are the most effective way to stimulate participation and involvement in an organization. Their positive benefits include: 1) more sharing and integration of individual skills and resources; 2) tapping unknown team member resources; 3) more stimulation, energy, and endurance for team members; 4) more emotional support among team members; 5) better performance in terms of quantity, quality, and innovation; 6) better ideas generated for problem solving; 7) more commitment, loyalty, feelings of ownership, higher motivation and satisfaction by team members; and 8) more effort to reach team goals (pg. 64). Eisenstat and Cohen (cited in Hackman, 1990) explain why team leadership is more effective than solo leadership. They assert that 1) a leadership team's decisions are more apt to represent a wide range of interests, 2) there is a possibility for more creative solutions, 3) team members and the constituencies they represent should better understand and support decisions they have had a role in shaping, 4) communication among top managers should be more efficient, 5) team leadership spreads the burden and ensures that important tasks receive adequate attention, and 6) serving on a leadership team provides valuable development for its members. Gabarro (1987), in his study on managerial success, found that the most successful managers tended to rely on management teams, while managers with poor records did not. Bensimon and Neumann (1993) questioned whether or not a complex team was more likely to do good things for a college than a simple team. They concluded that since the effects of leadership are not always immediately obvious, complex teams may serve as signs that the college as a whole is turning toward complex thinking and doing. The leadership that is being exerted to make the team a team is also likely being exerted to make the college a thinking and learning college. In summary, the authors believe that complex team leadership is more effective than single-person leadership because it requires shared responsibility for thinking as much as for doing, and enhances the team's involvement with campus life.

Purpose of the Study

The focus of this study is on presidential team leadership in community colleges. The study will examine the relationship between the president's cognitive frame of reference and its impact on team effectiveness, the team's functional domain, the team's cognitive complexity, simple versus complex teams, and "real" versus "illusory" teamwork.

This study is based on the research of Bensimon and Neumann (1993), who studied fifteen institutions of higher education and found that there were three basic functions of teams: 1) the utilitarian function, to help presidents achieve a sense of rationality and maintain control over institutional functioning; 2) the expressive function, to reinforce a sense of connectedness among team members; and 3) the cognitive function, to enlarge the intelligence of individual team members and to enable the team to act as a creative system. Bensimon and Neumann (1993) discovered that a president who could conceive all of the three team functions, rather than just one or even two, was much more likely to mold a "real" team. Presidents with "real" teams saw their teams as "performing at least one useful activity in each of the three functional domains" (pg. 45). Conversely, presidents with "illusory" teams used their groups only in one or two of the three functional domains. The functional domain most associated with "illusory" teams is the utilitarian; these teams give little attention to the process of thinking or creating together and most resemble traditional management or hierarchical interactions of the past.

Bensimon and Neumann (1993) found that institutional size and type also influenced whether the president utilized real or illusory teams. In their study, presidents in small institutions were more apt to have real teams, while presidents in large institutions were more likely to have illusory teams. They also found that small, private, four-year colleges were more likely to use real teams than the large, public universities. Bensimon and Neumann (1993) postulate that tightly coupled smaller institutions are more conducive to tightly coupled real teams; conversely, large loosely coupled universities are antithetical to real and complex teamwork. Although Bensimon and Neumann (1993) included three community colleges in their study of fifteen institutions, they did not reveal the outcomes of the community college research in their published report. It is not known, therefore, whether the community college teams more closely resembled those in small, private, four-year colleges or those in the large, loosely coupled universities. This omission is indicative of the paucity of research on community colleges in general and community college team leadership in particular.

The purposes of this study are to: 1) examine three presidential leadership teams in community colleges of similar size, and discover what similarities and differences exist in the teams' perceptions of team leadership effectiveness; 2) determine what commonalities, if any, exist in the composition of community college presidential teams; 3) evaluate the presidents' cognitive frame(s) of reference, the teams' functional domain(s), and the teams' cognitive complexity; and 4) assess whether or not the presidents' cognitive frame(s) influence the team's functional domain(s); and 5) determine whether the teams are complex "real" teams or simple "illusory" teams.

The research questions are:

1) What are the characteristics and composition of presidential teams in community colleges?

2) How does the community college president's cognitive frame(s) of reference influence the team's functional domain(s)?

3) Are there any differences in the way members of the president's team perceive their participation in team leadership activities and the effectiveness of those activities?

4) How cognitively complex are community college leadership teams?

5) Are presidential teams in community colleges real or illusory?

Definition of Terms

Team - A small number of people with complementary skills who are committed to a common purpose, performance goals, and approach for which they hold themselves mutually accountable. (Katzenbach and Smith, 1993, pg. 45)

Team leadership - Empowered participation in institutional governance via interactive, collaborative, and shared decision making; the agendas of the team are created and negotiated by all. Team leadership focuses on shared meaning, both the creation of meaning as well as the discovery of meaning that others believe and value (Bensimon and Neumann, 1993).

Team leader - The team member who coordinates the team's internal activities and serves as the point of communication by bringing outside information into the team and sharing key information about team activities with other teams and managers (Wellins, Byham, and Dixon, 1994, 320).

The team leader thus serves as the "boundary manager" by focusing on the environment surrounding the team (Fisher, 1993, pg. 124). In a president's team in higher education, the team leader role may be shared by some or all of the team members at various times (Bensimon and Neumann, 1993).

Team functional domains - A three-part framework for thinking about the functions of leadership teams. Presidents make use of the work of their teams in the following functional areas:

> the *utilitarian* function includes providing information, coordinating, planning, and making decisions;
>
> the *expressive* function includes providing mutual support and providing counsel to the president; and
>
> the *cognitive* function includes viewing problems from multiple perspectives, questioning, challenging, arguing, monitoring, and providing feedback (Bensimon and Neumann, 1993, pg. 33-44).

Cognitive teamwork - The abstract activities of perceiving, discovering, thinking, creating, talking, speculating, and arguing. Cognitive teamwork is *thinking* versus *doing* (Bensimon and Neumann, 1993, pgs. 54-55).

Cognitive role - See "thinking role."

Team thinking - Assumes that team members see the world differently, process information differently, and make sense of life in organizations and outside of them differently. Team thinking requires that team members develop their own thinking capacities and exercise them openly, actively, and freely, and are open to the different thinking processes of the other team members (Bensimon and Neumann, 1993, pg. 57).

Thinking role (also referred to as Cognitive role) - Different thinking processes or styles that individual team members bring to, or induce within, the president's team. Neumann (1991) describes eight thinking roles commonly found on a president's team:

> *Definer* - voices a view of the team's reality;
>
> *Analyst* - provides a deep examination of issues defined;
>
> *Interpreter* - translates how people outside the team are likely to see the issues;
>
> *Critic* - redefines, reanalyzes, or reinterprets the issues;
>
> *Synthesizer* - facilitates a summation of the team's reality;
>
> *Disparity Monitor* - assesses how people outside the team make sense of the team's actions;
>
> *Task Monitor* - strives to remove obstacles to team thinking and facilitates the team's work; and
>
> *Emotional Monitor* - establishes and maintains the human and emotional context within which team thinking occurs (Bensimon and Neumann, 1993, pg. 59).

Cognitive frame of reference - Cognitive frames are conceptual maps for understanding an organization and interpreting the effectiveness of others' behavior. Frames focus the attention of individuals and can also serve as cognitive blinders, leaving what is "out of frame" unseen and unattended. There are four frames to observe and interpret the academy (Birnbaum, 1992, pg. 63-64):

> 1) the *bureaucratic* frame, which focuses on structure and organization and emphasizes setting priorities, making orderly decisions, and communicating through established lines of authority;
>
> 2) the *collegial* frame, which focuses on the achievement of goals through collective action and emphasizes building consensus, problem solving through teams, loyalty and commitment to the institution, and leading by example;
>
> 3) the *political* frame, which focuses on monitoring internal and external environments and the use of influence to mobilize needed resources, and emphasizes establishing relationships with constituencies, developing coalitions, and constructing compromises; and
>
> 4) the *symbolic* frame, which focuses on the management of meaning via interpreting the institution's history, maintaining its culture, and reinforcing its values by emphasizing language, myths, stories, and rituals to foster shared meaning and beliefs.

Perceptions of team leadership - The cognitive images that the chief executive officers, members of the president's leadership team, administrators, faculty, and staff have about how team leadership functions or does not function on their respective campuses. These images represent reality from the perspective of the participants.

Real teams - Performance of at least one useful activity in each of the three functional domains (utilitarian, expressive, and cognitive) is required to have a real team. Presidents with real teams think of them in complex ways and describe their utilitarian function as decision making and planning (Bensimon and Neumann, 1993, pg. 45). In addition, real teams are cognitively complex and reflect four of the five "core" thinking roles (Bensimon and Neumann, 1993, pg. 167)

Illusory teams - Presidents with illusory teams usually are more comfortable working with their cabinet one to one. These teams usually function only in the basic, utilitarian domain of "doing," and do not perform useful activities in either the cognitive or the expressive domains (Bensimon and Neumann, 1993, pg. 45). Illusory teams de-emphasize the thinking roles and usually lack two or more of the "core" cognitive roles (Bensimon and Neumann, 1993, pg. 167).

Significance of the Study

As the benefits of team leadership as discovered in the literature seem to far outweigh the disadvantages, this method of governance merits serious consideration for all institutions of higher education. According to Bassin (1988), teams are the most effective way to stimulate participation and involvement in the institution. Team leadership is an emerging paradigm in higher education, but very little has been written about it, particularly as it pertains to community colleges. A search of the literature revealed no studies on community college team leadership, so it appears no one has attempted to look at this phenomenon via the framework of the cognitive team model described by Bensimon and Neumann (1993), or any other team model. There is not enough in the literature on teams in higher education to know whether the Bensimon and Neumann (1993) study is the most appropriate, or if there are others that would be more appropriate for the study of presidential teams in community college settings. The Bensimon and Neumann (1993) framework, however, presents a different way of looking at team leadership--the idea of cognitive roles and the team builder's frame of reference has not been duplicated in the literature. In addition, this study is specific to institutions of higher education, while most of the other literature on teams comes from the business world.

As community colleges traditionally have been bureaucratic institutions (Cohen and Brawer, 1996), a researcher might ask how it is possible to change a traditionally bureaucratic college into a team oriented, lateral organization with collaborative governance processes? Is it substantially different to implement team leadership in a community college, or are the processes described by Bensimon and Neumann (1993) the same as in the four-year colleges and universities? Do community college presidents see teams as effective means of decision making and governing? Teams are very popular now in the business literature (e.g., Fisher, 1993; Helgesen, 1995; Katzenbach and Smith, 1993; Kouzes and Posner, 1995; Ray and Bronstein, 1995; Senge, 1990; and Wellins, Byham and Dixon, 1994), and it will be insightful to discover how teams are perceived and implemented in the community college. It is hoped that this study will reveal lessons learned about presidential teams in community colleges, enable others in community college leadership roles to see their institutions in a similar vein, and stimulate community college presidents to consider a leadership team as important utilitarian, cognitive, and expressive functions in college governance.

The following chapters describe the research study in depth. Chapter Two presents a review of the literature-relevant to this study of team leadership; specifically, the literature on community colleges and community college governance, the literature on community college presidential leadership, team leadership in both the business and higher education environments, team leadership effectiveness, and the literature on cognitive frames of reference. Chapter Three describes the qualitative research methodology used to conduct the study including the role of the researcher, issues of validity and reliability, the pilot study, research sample, data collection and analyses, and study limitations. Chapter Four presents the results of the study and provides a thick, rich description of the three community college presidential teams. Chapter Five provides an analysis of the cases across all sites, including the major themes of team leadership effectiveness. The teams' demographic profile and milieux, presidents' cognitive frames, team functional domains, and team cognitive complexity will also be summarized across all sites. Chapter Six identifies the major themes and conclusions of the study, including implications for professional practice and future research.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

There are four areas of theory and research relevant to this study on team leadership in community colleges: 1) the literature on community colleges; 2) the literature on community college presidential leadership; 3) the literature on team leadership and its effectiveness in both the business and higher education environments; and 4) the literature on cognitive frames of reference.

The first area provides the foundation for an understanding of the position that community colleges occupy in the higher education landscape, their purposes, governance structure, and the current challenges facing them. The second area describes the leadership role of community college presidents and its importance in building effective teams. The third area focuses on the forces of evolution for teams and team leadership in the business world, and explores how these forces are encouraging a similar evolution to teams in higher education. The effectiveness of team leadership is also examined. The fourth area provides an overview of the cognitive frames of reference, and explores the relationship of the president's cognitive frame(s) to the functional domains of leadership teams.

Literature on Community Colleges

Community colleges have been defined by Cohen and Brawer (1996, pg. 5), as "any institution accredited to award the Associate of Arts or the Associate in Science as its highest degree." This definition incorporates the public or private comprehensive two-year college as well as public or private technical institutes. In 1994, there were 1,236 public and private community colleges which enrolled over six million students, representing 37 percent of all college students nationally (Cohen and Brawer, 1996, pgs. 15, 39). One-half of all students beginning postsecondary education enroll first in a two-year college, and of those students who delayed entry into higher education until they were thirty or older, 68 percent began in a community college (Cohen and Brawer, 1996, pgs. 45-46).

Of the 1,236 extant community colleges, the dominant institutional type is the comprehensive community college. A comprehensive community college serves as a community resource for pre-baccalaureate education, technical training, remedial education, lifelong learning, economic development, cultural enrichment, and recreational services for all who can benefit from them (Palmer, 1994). According to Cohen and Brawer (1994), the idea of serving everyone with any type of desired instructional program has been dominant in community colleges for the past fifty years. Community college leaders assert that the institutions "contribute to the well-being of their community by providing access for people who would not otherwise be able to participate in postsecondary education" (Cohen and Brawer, 1994, pg. 9). The overarching goal in the quest to serve everyone is to "help people toward a better life" (Cohen and Brawer, 1994, pg. 20).

As most community colleges are public agencies, their support is dependent upon the perceptions of their value by the public they serve. Hence, community college administrators function within a political system "where public relations, coalitions, inter-institutional cooperation, and image guide decisions regarding support" (Cohen and Brawer, 1994, pg. 8).

Community college leaders operate in the late 1990s in a time of uncertainty and change. Hodges and Milliron (1997, pg. 1) report that "massive fluctuations in national, state, and local economies, wide legislative swings, significant demographic shifts, and expensive and seemingly unending technological improvements" loom on a national level. Locally, community college leaders are faced with "state system priorities, board changes, faculty unions or associations, and a host of other quandaries" (Hodges and Milliron, 1997, pg. 1). Addressing the pace of change facing community colleges today, Phelan (1997, pg. 33) proposes a redirection of the community college focus and tradition of "being all things to all people" to an emphasis on developing a market niche based on college proficiencies. He asserts that "the key to the long-term success of the community college movement lies in each college defining, developing, and further promoting its successful niches." To propose so radical a departure from all that comprehensive community colleges have espoused for 50 years illustrates the turbulent times that are facing college leadership teams. McClure and Stanco (1996, pg. 1) assert that community college teams are "weary" and often feel as though "they are racing against the winds of societal, technological, educational, and economic change with little or no support or understanding."

In order to cope with these uncertainties and changes, community colleges have to become more like businesses, and institute performance measures based on cost, quality, and quantity, according to Gordon (1995). In addition, they have to adopt continuous improvement practices such as benchmarking, working in teams, and eliminating "traditional fiefdoms," and will have to rely less on public funding and "operate as if survival is at stake" (pg. 2).

The first annual Critical Issues Think Tank sponsored by the Consortium for Community College Development (Carter and Alfred, 1996) identified the critical issues and their implications facing community colleges in the future. The key issue identified was the need to increase the capacity of community colleges to effectively respond to change. One participant in the think tank described community colleges as "slow moving cruise ships in an ocean full of speedboats" (pg. 1). The think tank called for organizational transformation to meet the demands of the future, which included rethinking the traditional model of organizational structure, systems, and culture. Structures that continue to be defined in terms of a traditional hierarchy, according to the think tank participants, limit the ability of community colleges to become "true learning institutions" (pg. 8). Traditional internal reward systems discourage innovation and risk-taking, and require customers to adjust to the college's needs and ways of doing business. Organization of the colleges into silos insulates faculty and staff from one another and from the institution as a whole. Cross-functional teams were seen as a way of keeping pace with the changing needs of the community and finding new, innovative ways of responding.

In concert with this view, the heart of successful change strategies in community colleges, according to Sarantos (1994), is a synergistic environment. An organization in a synergistic environment does not resist change, but embraces it. Creating a synergistic environment requires empowered workers, participative management, and teamwork. Teamwork requires "shared vision, insight, ideas, open discussion, and respect for the values and input of others" (pg. 2). The author states that leaders in a synergistic environment must think and act proactively, be forceful and articulate in communicating a vision of lifelong learning, and promote interdependence and collaboration. These leaders will be required to work to build "real communities both within and outside of the institution" (pg. 2).

Community College Governance

Although the literature indicates that community colleges have a significant impact on higher education today, and are being significantly impacted by external forces, little research is done on them. Cohen and Brawer (1996, pg. 367) report that there is "no generally accepted national research agenda for community colleges, no consistently funded national agency charged with studying the institutions as unique entities, and few educational researchers directing their attention toward them." In addition, Cohen and Brawer (1996, pg. 367) report that the words "community college," "junior college," and "two-year college" do not appear in the index to the compendium of research on *The Impact of College on Students* (1969) by Feldman and Newcomb. Pascarella and Terenzini only cite a handful of studies on community college students out of more than 2,500 in the recent edition of *How College Affects Students* (1991).

Of the community college studies undertaken, most are related to community college functioning and are conducted by university-based researchers, national organizations, state agencies, and by researchers within the colleges. However, much of this research is driven by external mandates (Cohen and Brawer, 1996). As much of the literature on the governance of higher education focuses on four-year colleges and universities, there is a serious gap in the literature regarding community college governance. Much of what has been written about community college governance is imbedded in research conducted primarily on four-year institutions. For example, Bensimon and Neumann (1993) stated that they included three community colleges in their study of fifteen institutions, but never mentioned them again in the research results. Or, often times a few community colleges are included in a study that has a clear research bias toward the four-year institutions, and in the results analysis section are either not mentioned or are cited only briefly. It is difficult to reach conclusions about community colleges in a study that under-represents them in the research base. A search of the literature on community college team leadership revealed that there have been no major studies and very few articles written about this method of governance.

According to Bess (1988, pg. 168), modern universities are subjected to a number of stresses that "make traditional bureaucratic hierarchies inadequate to the complex prerequisites that must be met by successful organizations." These stresses include rapid shifts in the environment, autonomous line units, and multi-tiered decision making structures that are not able to communicate quickly and accurately. These stresses force the institution to create forms of organization to augment the hierarchy, such as senates and committee structures now distributed throughout higher education.

Richardson (1975) believed that analytical models that were proposed to explain the governance of universities do not pertain to the less complex community colleges. He proposed three models to explain community college governance: 1) the bureaucratic model, where structures are formal and hierarchical, authority is delegated from the top down, and students and faculty represent the bottom of the pyramid; 2) the political model, where a state of conflict and competition exists among students, faculty, administrators, and trustees, each with different interests; and 3) a collegial model where faculty and students are not at the bottom of a pyramid but equal partners in an educational community, where power and authority are shared and students and faculty communicate directly with the board rather than through the president. Cohen and Brawer (1996, pg. 103) maintain that community colleges are bureaucratic and political, and that despite all of the rhetoric about meeting the community's needs, the procedures maintained in the colleges tend toward protecting the "staff's rights, satisfaction, and welfare. The collegial or participatory model is a delusion; the notion that students have much voice in college administration has little basis in reality."

Despite the well-accepted premise that community colleges are bureaucratic in nature, governance in high achieving community colleges, according to Fryer (1989), may be evolving toward a model that incorporates the best of the collegial and bureaucratic models. In this new model, decision making is widely shared and all constituencies are both legitimate stakeholders and important participants in the institution. Acebo (1994) describes the movement toward shared governance and participatory management in community colleges as stemming from the broader, nationwide effort toward quality improvement, the advent of the information age, and the pressure of competition. These forces are making community college administrators aware of the benefits of collective rather than individual accomplishment. Cohen and Brawer (1994) also postulate that the traditional hierarchy of community college governance is beginning to give way to a flatter profile. This new view encourages staff members to participate as co-equals in generating ideas and participating in decision making. In this model, the environment is described as more caring, nurturing, and empowering with everyone working together to generate creativity.

Literature on Community College Presidential Leadership

Despite the great strides that many campuses have taken toward participatory governance and shared authority, some college presidents act almost alone in making decisions (Vaughan, 1989). Fisher (1984, pg. 12) argues that presidents *should* distance themselves from their constituents by placing themselves on a "presidential platform," which creates an aura of mystery about the presidency. Likewise, Vineyard (1993, pg. 14) asserts that the community college presidency "is a group of one," and that effective presidential leadership requires that it be "apart from all other constituencies, even that of administration." However, as community college presidents have not been concerned with ivory tower isolation in the past, and in a college devoted to the community, an appearance of isolation would be unacceptable (Vaughan, 1989).

The aura that used to surround founding presidents has vanished; today, presidents "must use new approaches to establishing legitimacy, including involving others in decision making" (Vaughan, 1986, pg. 204). One participant in Vaughan's (1986) study of community college presidents remarked:

> We must compromise today, and compromise does not mean weakness. To the contrary, the ability to compromise often means a great deal of strength. The authoritarian approach to management of the past does not work today; you may win the battle but lose the war. (pg. 205)

According to Boggs (1995, pg. 63), it is commonly assumed that "college administrators should work to satisfy the president and not the reverse." Boggs (1995) asserts that presidents should not ignore the needs and development of administrators, especially those who form the presidential leadership team, as they are dependent upon these administrators to give them advice and to represent them to the college's constituencies. Presidents can no longer lead single-handedly, and are dependent on a competent and dedicated team. Individual empowerment and acceptance of individual responsibility and initiative are important opportunities for presidential leadership. According to Vaughan (1992, pg. 61), "Presidents who empower constituents, share leadership responsibilities, and insist on individual initiative and responsibility are leaders who believe in human possibilities and the power of people to renew themselves and their societies." Gardner (cited in Vaughan, 1992, pg. 61) concurred by saying, "In the conventional mode, people want to know whether the followers believe in the leader; a more searching question is whether the leader believes in the followers."

Managing the institution, creating the campus climate, and interpreting and communicating the college mission are the three major functions of today's community college president, according to Vaughan (1989). In setting the campus climate, the president is responsible for "constantly stimulat[ing] individuals and groups to greater achievements in thought and action, which will move the institution to new heights in its service to the community and to the individual" (pg. 10-11). One of the gauges of campus climate is the degree to which all can participate in institutional governance. In a study of the presidency, Vaughan (1986) reported that all presidents included in the study felt that they must share decision making and governance with a number of people in the institution. Most presidents, according to Vaughan (1986) also believe that decision making should be delegated to the lowest possible level. A number of the presidents in his study also believe that the charismatic leadership that was required in the early phase of community college development is not what is needed today. Thus, the role of the president may be changing. Today, successful leaders must be flexible, creative, and more willing to involve others in decision making. According to Twombly and Amey (1994),

> ...building communities and effective teams requires the ability to articulate visions, goals, and ideals; to create functioning teams aligned with the pursuit of common goals; to assume team membership, which may not always mean team leadership; and to educate constituents about consensus building, teamwork, information sharing, and shared decision making. (pg. 272)

Given the complexities of modern organizational life and the trend toward working in teams in the business environment, community college presidents are faced with increasing pressure to create more participatory governance structures. However, in her study of presidential leadership, Bensimon (1989) found that community college presidents tended to espouse single-frame leadership theories, which may not be conducive to a team thinking orientation. Two of the five community college presidents in her study with a single frame leadership theory had a bureaucratic orientation, while the other three used either the collegial or symbolic orientation. Bensimon (1989) postulates that these results may be attributed to the fact that community college presidents view their colleges as closed systems because decision making has been centralized in the past. However, Vaughan (1986) suggests that the newer generation of community college presidents is more favorable to participatory leadership and shared decision-making.

External pressures, according to Baker (1992), have caused many community college presidents to turn their attention away from the "needs, expectations, and power of their internal environments" (pg. 5). These external pressures also create barriers to teamwork, as more of the presidents' attention is directed outward and more effort expended on external adaptation, which can result in alienation from the energy within their colleges. The focus of the presidents then becomes one of potential threats instead of potential opportunities, resulting in a lack of attention to institutional culture and isolation from their constituents. Vaughan (1994) also addressed the issue of increasing external demands on community college presidents. These demands were described as fund raising from private sources due to decreases in state and local funding, increased demands on institutional resources from business and industry, requirements to contribute to a global economy, and recent demands that community colleges play a greater role in partnering with other agencies to solve community problems. According to Vaughan (1994), these demands pull community college presidents away from the college's core mission and "into the vortex of what four-year presidents have for years referred to as the external presidency" (pg. 1).

Baker (1995) emphasizes the importance of the president in setting the tone for the institution, particularly in the development of the team concept. In concert with Yukl (1994), Baker asserts that the president must articulate a vision, develop trust and commitment, be committed to quality, and promote organizational learning. In addition, presidents must model their beliefs. They must demonstrate commitment, reinforce the common vision, and participate in learning about and from the institution. They must share their power for making decisions and creating change with the leadership team, and encourage teamwork. Presidents must also coach, support, and develop team skills in order for the team to accomplish a complex mission. The degree of success of the president, according to Baker (1995), is determined by the effectiveness of the presidential leadership team. Boggs (1995, pg. 73) states, "the way the team operates is extremely important in establishing a climate for excellence throughout the college." It is incumbent upon the president, therefore, to empower his or her team to perform effectively. The president should serve as a coach and leader who supports team members, gives them advice, and gives them the latitude to do their jobs without detailed supervision. Presidents should serve as ideal role models and mentors for the members of their teams, and create an environment free of institutional bureaucracy in which team members feel free to offer creative solutions to problems and even disagree with the president.

The community college leaders of tomorrow will command and direct less, and will spend more time coaching, converting, and persuading according to Duncan and Harlacher (1991). They will be unifiers of diverse points of view and facilitators of cooperation among diverse constituencies. They will encourage employees to be active participants in institutional governance, and to be accountable for the decisions they make. Instead of being authoritarian decision-makers, they will facilitate, coach, sponsor, and mentor future leaders and create an environment in which innovation and creativity can flourish.

Literature on Teams and Team Leadership

Team Leadership in Business and Industry

A considerable body of literature exists on teams, team development, and team leadership in the business and industry environment. Bassin (1988) asserts that teams are the most effective way to stimulate participation and involvement in an organization. He cites interfunctional teams as the most critical factor in enabling and promoting "peak performance." The key ingredient in such teams is the sense of ownership, involvement, and responsibility needed by all team members to meet challenges. It is the positive interaction among team members, each impacting and reinforcing the others, that enables the team to reach a higher level of performance than if they worked individually. Hogan, Curphy, and Hogan (1994) state that there are several challenges to leadership in the new millennium: 1) as competition for talented employees will increase and managerial responsibilities will expand, the overall quality of management must improve; 2) with an increased emphasis on productivity, the performance of senior managers will be more closely scrutinized; 3) management practices will have to change as the workforce, and management, become more diverse; and 4) little is known about how to manage teams whose primary tasks include creativity, innovation, problem solving, and the development of new knowledge and methods (pg. 500). Dealing with these challenges and dealing with peak performance will require a collaborative effort by all organizational constituencies--team leadership. Senge (1990, pg. 4) states:

> It is just not possible any longer to 'figure it out' from the top, and have everyone else following the orders of the 'grand strategist.' The organizations that will truly excel in the future will be the organizations that discover how to tap people's commitment and capacity to learn at all levels in an organization.

Tjosvold and Tjosvold (1991) report that teamwork is required up and down the hierarchy and across groups and divisions. People throughout the organization are united by vision, empowered to work together to realize the vision, explore issues and decisions through debate, and reflect on conflicts and progress to promote ongoing improvement. Katzenbach and Smith (1993) listed the following elements necessary for good team leadership: 1) keep the purpose, goals, and approach relevant and meaningful; 2) build commitment and confidence; 3) strengthen the mix and level of skills; 4) manage relationships with outsiders, including removing obstacles; 5) create opportunities for others; and 6) do real work (pgs. 139-144).

Other literature on various aspects of teams in the business environment includes Hackman (1990) and Larson and LaFasto (1989) on team effectiveness, Bennis and Nanus (1985) and Kanter (1983) on empowerment and change, Harris (1989), McCann and Margerison (1989), and Manz and Sims (1989) on the leader's role. In summary, the characteristics of effective team leaders that are most often mentioned in the business literature include the abilities to: 1) be responsive and build trust and openness; 2) provide vision and communicate the vision; 3) set high expectations and monitor performance; 4) create a climate for decision making that permits team members to use their talents; and 5) enable team members to use power, create change, and to develop both personally and professionally (Riechmann, 1991, pg. 29).

Although the literature points out that effective team leaders share power and decision making, Katzenbach and Smith (1993) indicate that deeply ingrained biases toward individual accountability and achievement negatively influence team work at the executive level. Teams at the top must develop mutual trust and interdependence, yet executive leaders find it difficult to allow their performance to depend on other people when the risk of failure is so great. It is usually the job of the leader that is on the line when team performance does not match expectations set by boards of directors. As the leader of the team has a unique role and influence, it is commonly assumed that the leader either makes or breaks the team's performance. This assumption places more pressure on the leader to carry the responsibility for the effectiveness of the team's performance, and as a result many leaders and top executives are cautious about giving up their decision making responsibility to other executives, much less a team. Leaders are not supposed to express uncertainty or depend on others for help. They are expected to know all of the answers. Thus, it is difficult for top executives to be team leaders, which inhibits the sharing of a common purpose, goals, and accountability.

Teams at the top, according to Katzenbach and Smith (1993), are the most difficult to implement. In their study of teams, they found far fewer examples of real teams at the top of an organization than elsewhere, but where real teams did exist, the authors found that the teams strongly influenced the organization's performance. The authors identified "five popular yet misguided beliefs" (pg. 217-221) about how executives are expected to perform that get in the way of real teamwork. The first myth is that the purpose of the team at the top is the same as the purpose of the company. In contrast, leading an organization is an abstract challenge that is difficult to assess and takes a long time to realize. What is missing, according to the authors, is a set of performance goals and work products that the team sets for itself, rather than for the company. The second myth is that the entire group at the top of the organization has to be on the team. The authors do not argue that teams at the top should exclude some individuals, but that instead of becoming a single team, they become several teams united to approach a specific performance challenge with the best combination of skills to address the problem. The objective then becomes increasing the amount of team performance at the top, not just becoming a single team at the top.

The third myth identified by Katzenbach and Smith (1993), is that the roles and contributions of team members are defined by their hierarchical and functional positions. The authors suggest that determining team membership based on skills, and not position, relieves the constraint of hierarchy imposed on teams at the top, and non-hierarchically oriented assignments provide the building blocks for team performance. The fourth myth identified by the authors is that the amount of time spent in team activities is inefficient. Busy executives rarely have much discretionary time, and spend most of their time leading people in other parts of the organization. They tend to minimize the amount of time spent together by sticking to well-prioritized agendas. Thus, unlike other teams, executive groups do not tend to do real work together. They are expected to delegate work down the line and then review the results in their meetings. The authors suggest that in order to do the real work of teams, all team members including the leader should have assignments and tasks that they do themselves. Doing real work creates a personal investment in the outcomes and garners mutual respect, trust, and accountability from teammates. The final myth described by the authors is that team effectiveness depends only on communications and openness. Conversely, the authors assert that the purpose of these behaviors is to enhance the quality of decisions, but they do not necessarily reflect team work products or a sense of mutual accountability.

Despite the difficulties encountered in establishing teams at the executive level, Wellins, Byham and Dixon (1994) see the following leadership trends for the future: 1) teams will expand exponentially and service industries will expand the use of teams; 2) support systems, such as compensation, performance management, and training, will continue to evolve in order to support the team concept; 3) radical organizational changes will increase the need for teams; 4) permanent teams will be replaced by virtual teams, which are temporary cross-functional teams made up of members who come together to work on a particular project or task (a model well suited for higher education); 5) the role of the "boss" will disappear as organizations continue to flatten their hierarchies while the number of teams will increase; and 6) social changes will support organizational teamwork through our social and educational systems (pg. 339-345).

Team Leadership in Higher Education

Although the academic environment, which provides an open forum for debate and the free exchange of ideas, should be the ideal setting for team leadership, not much research has been done on team leadership in higher education.

In some respects, the academic environment encourages competition and discourages team structures. Autonomy and collegiality are more pronounced in the work of the faculty, but administrators tend to operate in an hierarchical, bureaucratic environment (Guskin and Bassis, 1985). Weber and Karman (1989) argued that collegial bureaucracies should be transformed "by restructuring and realigning the channels of communication and personnel into interactive groups or teams," (pg. 52) and discussed strategies for developing teams in academic settings.

Bing and Dye (1992) state that in a college or university, the hierarchical model of decision making erodes any sense of community and discourages wide participation in academic life. According to the authors, the traditional purpose of the academy is to "seek and send truth" (pg. 18). They assert that critical debate and the free exchange and examination of ideas should be shared by all in a partnership. In concert, Tierney (1989) writes that the postmodern interpretation of democracy is one of emancipation and empowerment, and that "critical leadership" will be required to advance democracy in colleges and universities. The major objective for critical leadership is to "aid in the creation of those voices which have been muffled or silenced by relations of power" (pg. 164). The critical leader views leadership as a "reciprocal relationship among individuals" operating in a sense of mutuality within a "centrarchy" rather than a hierarchy (pg. 164).

One dissertation directly related to leadership teams in higher education was by Riechmann (1991), in which team leader effectiveness in high-involvement, high-performance teams in higher education was studied. Riechmann (1991) found that leadership existed both as a role and as a function; there were power and authority in the role of the leader, and the leader exercised authority in carrying out the responsibilities of the position.

In addition, leadership existed as a function in the team. Team members demonstrated leadership in their units and in their positions as team members. Leadership was a shared and fluid process. The four elements Reichmann (1991) found as the model of leadership in high-involvement, high-performance academic teams were: 1) strategic direction; 2) facilitative climate; 3) collaborative processes; and 4) superior performance. These components of team leadership are complex, interactive, and interdependent.

Bensimon and Neumann (1993) present a unique model of teams in higher education. They describe teams as a cultural entity, a "web of actors connected to one another through norms, beliefs, rituals, values...through meaning that they continually construct and reconstruct" (pg. 24). In the cultural metaphor, teams are composed of "both consistency and difference, cohesion and fragmentation, creation and degeneration, unity and fragmentation. It considers how teams come together, grow together, and stay together, but it also examines the dynamics of their coming apart" (pg. 25). In their study of presidential teams in higher education, Bensimon and Neumann (1993) describe the three functions of the team as: 1) utilitarian, which includes providing information, coordinating and planning, and making decisions; 2) expressive, which includes providing mutual support and providing counsel to the president; and 3) cognitive, which includes viewing problems from multiple perspectives, questioning, challenging, arguing, monitoring, and feedback.

The cognitive team described by Neumann (1991) is usually the president's team, but other administrative or multi-constituency teams could function in the cognitive model as well. The cognitive team is a "sense-making system patterned after the human mind and is capable of perceiving, thinking, learning, and learning to learn" (pg. 487). This team model is different from teams described in the business literature, in that there are distinct, complementary "thinking" or "cognitive" roles that each team member plays. Team members may continuously play the same thinking role, or they may switch roles as the issues under discussion change, or as the culture or environment in which the team functions changes. There are eight thinking or cognitive roles, five of which are "core" roles and three are "supporting" roles. The core roles interact in "selecting, creating, elaborating, and shaping the issues the team attends to." The supporting roles "support, facilitate, maintain, and redirect" the work of the core (Bensimon and Neumann, 1993, pg. 60). In this model, the team constructs its own reality by virtue of these roles. The strength of the cognitive team is that members are likely to have a greater measure of success in a complex, turbulent environment than those who prefer to work alone, or those who ignore cognitive roles in building teams, or who develop teams with members who think alike.

The Bensimon and Neumann (1993) model of team leadership incorporates both functional and cognitive complexity. Teams that are functionally complex perform at least one useful activity in each of the three functional domains. Cognitively complex teams will possess at least four of the five core cognitive roles. Teams that are both functionally and cognitively complex are considered "real" teams. Simple teams lack the cognitive function and usually only perform functions in the utilitarian domain. Cognitively simple teams usually lack two or more of the five core cognitive roles. Teams that are both functionally and cognitively simple are considered "illusory" teams (pg. 167).

Team Leadership Effectiveness

In their research on team leadership, Bensimon and Neumann (1993) found that advocates of team-centered managerial approaches believe that they "enhance the capacity of organizations to master new knowledge and to use it effectively to improve innovation, problem solving, and productivity" (pg. ix). They also found that teams that have responded successfully to problems or challenges are composed of members with a high degree of diversity both in experience and point of view. Teams are also seen as an important source of support for presidents, as they have no peers on their own campuses. Mutual support, assistance, and reinforcement are as important for people in executive leadership positions as they are for those at lower levels in an organization. In addition, Bensimon and Neumann (1993) report that presidents feel a team approach encourages people to take responsibility for all of their actions, including their mistakes. The openness of a team also helps ensure that team members complete assignments on time.

Effective presidents, according to Bensimon and Neumann (1993), view their institutions in multiple ways utilizing various "cognitive frames" or "lenses" to filter information. However, they also found that very few presidents demonstrate the ability to use multiple lenses, and that very few have many strategies for dealing with change. Cognitive complexity, therefore, is a desirable but rare quality among college presidents. When cognitive complexity is considered a team attribute, however, its presence in an organization is much more likely. Multiple minds working together will be more complex than one mind working alone, thus enhancing leadership effectiveness.

Guzzo and Dickson (1996) compiled a review of recent research on groups and teams, giving emphasis to research that investigated the effectiveness of teams at work in organizations. Findings from the reviewed studies provide strong support for the value of teams to organizational effectiveness. Effectiveness in teams was indicated by team outputs, such as quality, quantity, speed, customer satisfaction, by the consequences a team has for its members, and by the enhancement of a team's capability to perform effectively in the future. The researchers found that there is clear evidence that team-based work brings about improved performance, especially in measures of efficiency and quality. Substantive participation is the type to "most likely result in significant, long-lasting increases in productivity" (pg. 331). Evidence was also found that organizations utilizing teams as an important element of the organization tended to excel in employee relations and product quality, although not in the area of customer service.

Guzzo and Dickson (1996, pg. 334) found that there are three "points of leverage" for intervening to enhance team effectiveness. The first is the design of the group, including membership, member roles and their coordination, and design of goals. Diversity of membership is positively related to team effectiveness, as are group goals. The second point of leverage is group process. Research has shown that group cohesiveness can contribute to performance, as can structured task processes. A factor that can constrain group process is the technology with which the group works, such as computers. Computer-assisted groups show less overall member participation. The third point of leverage for enhancing team effectiveness is the team context. Team performance can be enhanced by changing the conditions in which the team performs. Organizational leaders are part of the team context.

and have been shown to influence team effectiveness. The team context has the most consistent research support for affecting team performance. The authors conclude that "the greatest changes in team effectiveness are most likely to be realized when changes in teams' organizational context are supported by the appropriate team design and process" (pg. 335).

In Baker's overview of the research on team effectiveness (1995), he found that teams take advantage of the skills, talents, and expertise of all their members to meet performance objectives. They have a greater sum of total knowledge, a greater number of approaches to a problem, more participation in problem solving, and a better understanding of the decisions made. In addition, teams improve commitment, quality, and efficiency while lowering costs, absenteeism, and turnover. In addition, the value of synergy is often mentioned when describing team effectiveness--that of the whole being greater than the sum of the individual parts.

As with any leadership strategy, team leadership has its pitfalls. Dumaine (1994) found that teams often are formed with little or no training or support, no new changes in the design of their work, and no new systems to facilitate communication. These are the teams that are less likely to succeed. In addition, members must be truly empowered to organize their work and make decisions, or teams will fail. He also found that teams fall short of their promise when trust is lacking and when people issues are not dealt with frankly and openly.

Bensimon and Neumann (1993) indicated that the strengths of teamwork can occasionally also become weaknesses that undermine creative problem solving and cognitive complexity. For example, team members may want to direct the work of others rather than participate with them as equals. Teams that are not balanced in terms of thinking capacity and social skills may be disadvantaged in the range of issues to which they attend. Some teams may become so cohesive that they isolate themselves from the rest of the college, developing an administrative subculture that alienates them from the faculty subculture. Isolation from the larger institution causes the team to cease being effective and puts it at risk for collapse.

Teams may also fall into the trap of "groupthink" (Bensimon and Neumann, 1993, pg. 10), which refers to assumed consensus. Assumed consensus discourages individual team members from expressing an opposing point of view, raising important issues, or making critical observations. In addition, teamwork may silence different or opposing viewpoints due to the mythology of what it is to be a "team." The mythology holds that differences do not exist in a "team," so it is not legitimate to acknowledge them or discuss them. Women and members of minority groups, Bensimon and Neumann (1993) found, often feel out of sync with the rest of the team but often do not make their feelings known to the president or other team members. An emphasis on harmony may blind a group to differences in individual perspectives, causing teamwork to become superficial. Team members may pretend to cooperate by withholding dissent, even though they do not feel cooperation. This is a form of silencing by the team, and it differs from groupthink because members do not voluntarily surrender their opinions or prerogative to question team actions.

Teamwork is also very time consuming. Baker (1995) found that teams take much longer to make decisions, in some cases up to five times longer. Team building takes a great effort on the part of the president and all team members. Because team outcomes are not readily quantifiable or fully understood, there may be little incentive for team members to dedicate the time, energy, and thought to team building when there are so many other pressing demands. Team building is never ending, and because turnover in its membership is inevitable, the team is constantly rebuilding itself. "Recreating a team can take a great deal of time and energy on the part of the team builder," according to Bensimon and Neumann (1993, pg. 13).

Literature on Cognitive Frames of Reference

Bolman and Deal (1984) first organized the major schools of organizational thought into four perspectives, which they called "frames" to characterize different vantage points. They used the metaphor "frames," as they are windows on the world, and filter out some things while allowing others to pass through. Frames help people order the world and decide what action to take. Every manager uses a personal frame of reference to gather information, make judgments, and get things done. The four frames in the Bolman and Deal scheme are: 1) the structural frame, which emphasizes the importance of formal roles and relationships; 2) the human resource frame, because organizations are inhabited by people; 3) the political frame, which views organizations as arenas of scarce resources where power and influence affect the allocation of resources among individuals and groups; and 4) the symbolic frame, which abandons all of the assumptions of the other three frames and treats the organization as a theatre or a carnival (pg. 5-6).

Birnbaum (1988, 1992) adapted Bolman and Deal's frame schema to better fit higher education and developed four "cognitive frames" for academic leaders. Leaders who see their roles through the bureaucratic frame focus on the institution's structure and organization. Bureaucratic leadership emphasizes setting priorities, making orderly decisions, and communicating through established lines of authority. Leaders who see their roles through the collegial frame focus on the achievement of goals through collective action. Collegial leaders build consensus, problem solve through teams, instill loyalty and commitment to the institution, and lead by example. Leaders who use the political frame focus on monitoring internal and external environments and use influence to mobilize needed resources. Political leaders emphasize establishing relationships with constituents, developing coalitions of support, negotiating compromises, and keeping communication lines open. Leaders who use the symbolic frame focus on the management of meaning through interpreting the institution's history, maintaining its culture, and reinforcing its values. Symbolic leaders use language, myths, stories, and rituals to foster shared perceptions and beliefs (1992, pg. 63-64).

Frames represent cognitive lenses that can help community college presidents determine issues of importance, what questions to ask, what information to collect, how to define problems, and the courses of action to take. Presidents who can use multiple frames to analyze situations will more likely be effective than those who utilize only one or two. Presidents who use several frames and have the ability to switch from one to another may demonstrate a higher level of cognitive differentiation and integration (Bensimon, 1989).

The ability to view the organization through different lenses and interpret events in a variety of ways is becoming more important as the college environment is becoming increasingly more complex. College presidents must play many different roles, and those who can think and act by using all four frames are more able to fulfill their complex duties. Analyzing presidents' cognitive frame of reference is important in discovering their espoused leadership theories, and concomitantly the way they see themselves or the way they want others to see them.

Bolman and Deal (1992) have applied their theory of cognitive frames to the idea of teamwork. They assert that because organizations are full of "ambiguity, complexity, turbulence, and confusion" (pg. 35), managers are unable to attend to everything. In order to simplify, they filter and interpret events and experiences through the cognitive frames. Research on teams has found, according to the authors, that structural and human resource variables are critical to team effectiveness. However, they assert that the research overlooks key elements in teamwork--the issues of power and conflict that often block teams from performing effectively. The symbolic elements of "flow, spirit, and magic that are at the core of extraordinary performance" are also overlooked (pg. 36). Bolman and Deal (1992) have found that the structural frame is most often linked to effectiveness as a manager, but the symbolic frame is the best predictor of effectiveness as a leader. Therefore, they believe that because practicing managers think like managers and not like leaders, many teams are overmanaged but underled. The authors enumerate eight symbolic tenets that contribute to a team's success: 1) how someone becomes a team member is important; 2) diversity gives a team a competitive advantage; 3) example rather than command holds a team together; 4) a specialized language fosters cohesion and commitment; 5) stories carry history and values, while reinforcing team identity; 6) humor and play reduce tension and encourage creativity; 7) ritual and ceremony renew spirit and reinforce values; and 8) informal cultural players make contributions disproportionate to their formal roles (pp. 38-42). To Bolman and Deal (1992, pg. 43), "soul" or symbolic elements are the real secret of a team's success. They believe that the essence of high performance is "spirit." Banishing play, ritual, ceremony, and myth, will destroy teamwork, not enhance it. They summarize:

> Team building at its heart is a spiritual undertaking. It is the creation of a community of believers, united by shared faith and shared culture. It is a search for the spirit within. Peak performance emerges as a team discovers its soul. (pg. 44)

Summary

This review of the literature has examined the forces that are changing leadership and management practices in both the business and community college environments. These forces include fluctuations in the economy, demographic shifts, technological improvements, the nationwide effort toward quality improvement, increasing competition, and the rapid pace of societal change. Coping with these changes has created the need for a higher level of performance, particularly at the executive level, in both business organizations and community colleges. The most effective way to stimulate peak performance and meet the current challenges is through the collaborative action of empowered teams. Team leadership strengthens the capacity of the organization to create, innovate, solve problems, and develop new knowledge and methods. Team leadership is difficult to implement in an academic environment and particularly at the executive level, but once it is in place it can positively influence the organization's performance. The leadership orientation of the chief executive also strongly influences the effectiveness of the team. One model of presidential team leadership in the higher education environment, the cognitive team, is explored in depth and forms the basis for this study of team leadership in community colleges.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this chapter the methodology used to conduct the study is described. An overview of qualitative research design including the role of the researcher and issues of validity and reliability are included, as well as information on the pilot study, research sample, data collection, data analysis, and study limitations.

Qualitative Research Design

The research method selected for this study was the qualitative multi-site case study. The paucity of research on team leadership in higher education, and in community colleges in particular, coupled with the replication of a prior qualitative study suggested the use of qualitative research methods.

Nonexperimental research designs such as the case study answer the questions "how" and "why," and are used by researchers interested in "insight, discovery, and interpretation rather than hypothesis testing" (Merriam, 1988, pg. 10). Merriam (1988, pp. 11-12) lists four characteristics that are essential in a qualitative case study: 1) *particularistic*, meaning that the case study focuses on a particular situation, event, program, or phenomenon; 2) *descriptive*, meaning that the product of the case study is a "thick description" of the phenomenon studied; 3) *heuristic*, meaning that the case study will illuminate understanding of the phenomenon under study; and 4) *inductive*, meaning that the case study relies on inductive reasoning. Discovery of new relationships, concepts, or understandings characterize the qualitative case study. Overall, the research objective is to understand the meaning of an experience, and how all of the component parts work together to form a whole (Merriam, 1988).

Qualitative research assumes that there are multiple realities to be studied, and that these realities are highly subjective and in need of interpreting rather than measuring. Beliefs and not facts form the basis of perception. Case study research is exploratory, inductive, and emphasizes process rather than ends. It is a naturalistic inquiry where the researcher observes, intuits, and senses what is occurring in a natural setting (Merriam, 1988).

In this multi-site case study, the researcher was interested in understanding the phenomenon holistically. Therefore, the researcher collected and analyzed data from several sites. Each site was first treated as a case in and of itself, and data were gathered to learn as much as possible about the contextual variables that might influence the case. Next, the cases were compared and contrasted to discover commonalities and differences. Miles and Huberman (cited in Merriam, 1988, pg. 154) state that "by comparing sites or cases, one can establish the range of generality of a finding or explanation, and at the same time, pin down the conditions under which that finding will occur." The individual cases in a multi-site case study should be selected for their power to both maximize and minimize differences in the phenomenon being studied. In this research study, the researcher attempted to control for any effects due to institutional size, such as the president's span of control or leadership orientation, by selecting three institutions of similar size.

Analysis of the multi-site case study can be as simple as a unified description across cases, or "it can build categories, themes, or typologies that conceptualize the data from all cases, or it can lead to building substantive theory offering an integrated framework covering multiple cases" (Merriam, 1988, pg. 156). The analysis of this study includes description within cases first, across all cases second, and finally establishes themes which answer the research questions.

The reasons for selecting the qualitative approach to this study were to: 1) conduct a naturalistic inquiry by studying the composition and operating style of presidential leadership teams; 2) describe the processes of presidential team leadership, 3) discover the meaning attached to participation on presidential leadership teams, and 4) develop new understandings of community college team leadership. The intent was to follow a process that was particularistic, descriptive, heuristic, and inductive in answering the research questions.

Role of the Researcher

In a qualitative case study, the researcher is the "primary instrument for gathering and analyzing data" (Merriam, 1988, pg. 36). The human investigator is fallible just like any other research instrument; therefore, questions must be asked to assure that the researcher is capable of collecting meaningful data.

The first question to answer is whether or not the researcher possessed the skills necessary for qualitative research. In this instance, the researcher took a doctoral level research methods course where qualitative research methods were explored. In addition, the researcher conducted naturalistic interviews as part of class assignments in doctoral-level courses, for the master of public administration fieldwork requirement and research conducted for the master's thesis, and research conducted for the honor's thesis for the bachelor's degree.

The researcher's role in this study was that of detective--to search for all of the pieces of the puzzle in order to answer the research questions. The researcher utilized the method of triangulation to collect data in the form of interviews, observations, and documents. In addition, triangulation was used to compare and contrast the research subjects' perceptions of team leadership. The researcher determined what institutions to study, how data were collected and analyzed, and what documents were analyzed. The researcher asked for and acquired needed documentation, including organizational charts, job descriptions, resumes, and demographic data about each team and each subject. In addition, the researcher observed the president's leadership team in a naturalistic setting while conducting the interviews and also by observing a meeting of the leadership team on-site.

In searching for personal biases of the researcher, it was determined that there were few due to the following factors: 1) the researcher did not personally know any of the presidents or their team members; 2) the researcher had very limited knowledge of the institutions included in the study; and 3) the researcher did not have any information about the institutions' cultures, presidential leadership styles, or college governance structure. Conversely, the researcher was a community college administrator and held a bias that team leadership is an emerging paradigm of community college governance based on personal experience.

Validity and Reliability

According to Walker (cited in Merriam, 1988, pg. 167), one of the assumptions underlying case study is that reality is "holistic, multidimensional, and ever-changing." Observations are of people's "construction of reality," and it is the case study researcher's job to "attempt to capture and portray the world as it appears to the people in it." For the case study researcher "what *seems* true is more important than what *is* true." Lincoln and Guba (cited in

Merriam, 1988) assert that judging the validity of a case study rests on the researcher showing "that he or she has represented those multiple constructions adequately, that is, that the reconstructions that have been arrived at via the inquiry are credible to the constructors of the original multiple realities" (pg. 168). Thus, the researcher is interested in perspective rather than "truth" and is obligated to present an honest reading of how the research subjects actually view themselves and their experiences. According to Merriam (1988), viewing reality in this manner makes internal validity a strength of qualitative research. Methods the researcher utilized to ensure internal validity were: 1) triangulation via multiple sources of data; 2) an outside source (Bensimon and Neumann, 1993) conducted a similar study utilizing a similar instrument in a similar setting; 3) member checking, when the research subjects were asked to review the transcripts of their interviews and determine if the data accurately represented what they said; 4) peers were asked to examine the data and findings to see if they would reach similar conclusions, and 5) researcher biases were clearly identified at the beginning of the study.

Reliability in research refers to the extent to which the findings of a study can be replicated. In qualitative research the investigator "seeks to describe and explain the world as those in the world interpret it" (Merriam, 1988, pg. 170). As there are many definitions of reality, there is no way that replication of a qualitative study will yield exactly the same results. Guba and

Lincoln (cited in Merriam, 1988) suggest that the term *reliability* does not fit qualitative research, and that instead of demanding the replication of results by outsiders, researchers should wish outsiders to concur that the results make sense given the data collected. In addition, Guba and Lincoln (cited in Merriam, 1988) state that "since it is impossible to have internal validity without reliability, a demonstration of internal validity amounts to a simultaneous demonstration of reliability" (pg. 176).

External validity can also be problematic in case study research. External validity refers to the extent to which the findings of one study can be applied to other situations, or "generalized" (Merriam, 1988, pg. 173). At issue is whether or not it is possible to generalize from one case or from qualitative research in general. As this case, however, is a multi-site case study of the same phenomenon utilizing predetermined questions and procedures for coding the data, generalizability is found in "lessons learned" and the extent to which this study can be utilized to assist other community college presidents in implementing leadership teams. In addition, the use of "rich, thick description" (pg. 177) will assist others in determining whether or not the data has transferability.

Pilot Study

In order to establish validity and reliability of the interview protocol, the researcher conducted a pilot study. The president and six members of the president's leadership team of a Midwestern community college were interviewed using the protocol established during the planning phase. The pilot study gave the researcher an opportunity to identify ambiguous, leading, or extraneous questions through feedback elicited from the participants. It also gave the researcher the opportunity to hone interviewing skills, become comfortable asking the interview questions, practice triangulation and recording of data, and examine the pilot study results for internal validity and reliability.

At the conclusion of the pilot study, the interview protocol was modified slightly (see Appendix C). One redundant question was eliminated and several optional follow-up questions were developed. Each person interviewed was asked for feedback, and no additional changes were suggested.

After completion of the pilot study, a research project application was submitted to the University of Kansas Advisory Committee on Human Experimentation for approval and to allow the researcher to go forward with the research project. After approval was received, the consent letters found in Appendix A were either mailed or hand delivered to the research subjects.

Research Sample

The sample used for this study consisted of three presidential teams in community colleges in two Midwestern states. The three community colleges were chosen to reflect three distinct geographic settings--a rural community college; a single-campus urban community college; and a suburban community college which is part of a multi-campus system. As size and institutional type were considered as influencing factors in Bensimon and Neumann's (1993) study of team leadership at four-year colleges, the researcher attempted to control for any effects of size in this study by selecting three community colleges of similar size. The medium-size community college (4,000 to 6,000 students) was selected in an attempt to control for such factors as disparity in team size and composition. The researcher assumed that there would be differences in each institution's culture, resources, and presidential leadership style and cognitive frame of reference.

Prior to beginning the study, the president of each college was contacted by telephone and letter and asked to participate in this study. The presidents were asked to provide the names and titles of all individual members of their cabinet, council, or leadership team. The total number of subjects, therefore, was determined by the reality of the construction of the three selected presidents' leadership teams. Although it was the researcher's attempt to interview all team members, on one team a member was not included in the interview process. The president of this team did not give the researcher the team member's name, and it was not discovered that this person was a member of the team until he was identified by the other team members during the interviews on-site.

Data Collection

After obtaining permission to interview the presidents and team members and observe a team meeting, the process of scheduling the interviews and team observation, collecting documentation, conducting interviews on-site, and team observation began.

First, each team member was asked to sign a Consent Form (Appendix A) giving permission to be interviewed, which assured that: 1) all responses would be kept strictly confidential; 2) her or his identity and college affiliation would not be revealed in the published dissertation; 3) he or she would be given the opportunity to check transcribed interviews for accuracy and make changes as necessary; and 4) he or she would be given a summation of the research results in the form of the final chapter of the dissertation.

Next, the researcher obtained the following documentation from each team: 1) an organizational chart of the institution; 2) a job description of each person interviewed; 3) a resume of each person interviewed; 4) a demographic survey completed by the presidents including name of the team, size of the team, and size of the college including number of college employees and number of students enrolled; and 5) a demographic survey completed by each team member including gender, age, ethnicity, highest degree earned, number of years at the college, number of years in the current position, and number of years on the president's leadership team. The Demographic Forms are found in Appendix B, and summaries of the demographic data appear in Chapter Four.

The interviews at each college were conducted within a few days of each other in order to preserve the researcher's initial impressions and to more effectively compare team members' responses (see interview protocol in Appendix C). Originally, the researcher intended to interview the presidents first and team members second, but the realities of scheduling busy executive administrators' time precluded this from happening. In one case, the president was interviewed second, and in two cases, the president was interviewed last. The order of interviewing did not seem to have a significant impact on the analyses of the data or on the researcher's impressions.

The observation of a team meeting was scheduled as closely to the conclusion of the interviews as possible to also help preserve initial impressions and provide for comparative impressions of member behavior outside of, and within, the team. In one case, the team observation was scheduled before the interviews, again due to difficulties in scheduling. As this was the last site studied and the researcher more attuned to observation of meeting behaviors, no significant impact was noted upon analysis of the data.

In order to discover whether or not the Bensimon and Neumann (1993) framework for team leadership works in the community college setting, and because there has been no previous research conducted on community college teams, the researcher used a modified version of the Bensimon and Neumann (1993, pgs. 165-166) interview protocol (Appendix C). The interview protocol was modified in order to better assess the team members' perceptions of team leadership and its effectiveness. Several questions were added and several were eliminated, also shortening the projected interviews to approximately one hour in length in order to accommodate busy executive schedules. These semi-structured interviews were intended to obtain similar information on team leadership from all subjects, but allowed the researcher to expand and probe to clarify meaning and elicit further information. The community college presidents were given a slightly different interview protocol to assess their cognitive frame(s) of reference in addition to their perceptions about team leadership.

Follow-up interviews or conversations were scheduled as necessary to clarify responses or complete the interview protocol. The research subjects were given the opportunity to examine transcripts of their interviews for accuracy, and make changes as needed.

Data Analyses

Analyses of the data were conducted utilizing methods described by Merriam (1988). A case study data base was assembled for each team that included the interview transcripts, field notes, demographic surveys, collected documentation, team observation checklist, and reflective memos. The goal of the data analyses, in accordance with Taylor and Bogdan (cited in Merriam, 1988, pg. 130), was to "come up with reasonable conclusions and generalizations based on a preponderance of the data."

Demographic Data

Complete demographic data are reported, as compiled from the collected surveys, documents, and interviews, and similarities and differences among teams are noted in the results.

Individual Interviews

A total of 15 on-site semi-structured interviews were conducted, and all were tape recorded with permission of the subjects in order to provide a faithful transcription of the interviews and to allow the researcher an opportunity to observe and record comments on the subjects' facial expressions and body language during the interviews. During the interviews, field notes were taken referencing emergent themes, such as cognitive role indicators, team functional domain(s), presidential cognitive frame(s), perceptions of team leadership, and any other observations of interactions. The interviews were transcribed verbatim following completion of the interviews for each team, generating 180 pages of single-spaced transcript. A copy of the interview transcript was sent to each team member for the purpose of member checking, and any resulting changes were incorporated into the transcripts. The process of content analysis of the transcripts followed methods described by Merriam (1988). A manual coding scheme for four pre-determined categories was developed to capture references to the teams' functional domain(s), the presidents' cognitive frame(s), and the core and supporting cognitive roles (Appendix E). The transcriptions were then coded and analyzed for evidence of the elements in the pre-determined categories and for convergence of themes both within the established categories and outside of the categories. The field notes and the transcribed interviews were compared and contrasted for theme congruence.

Following methods devised by Bensimon (1989), the president's cognitive frame was determined by coding the response to the question, "How do you define good presidential leadership?" and by further abstracting data from the entire interview transcript and the field notes of the team observation. The cognitive frame(s) identified from abstracted data were also used to determine the president's "espoused theories of leadership" in accordance with Bensimon (1989, pg. 423). Espoused theories of leadership were made up of two components--leadership as a process of providing direction, and the ways in which the presidents preferred to provide direction. If a cognitive frame was referenced at least twice in the president's interview, the researcher considered the referenced frame to be the president's espoused theory of leadership. If more than one frame was referenced twice, the researcher concluded that the president also utilized the other referenced frame. Presidents could espouse as many as four cognitive frames or as few as one. The frequency of references to a particular frame determined whether the frame was considered the president's primary frame; however, presidents could also use more than one frame equally. As espoused theories may not accurately reflect what presidents actually do, leadership theories in use were determined by coding the interview transcripts of the team members for references to the president's frame(s). If the team members collectively referenced a cognitive frame at least twice, the researcher considered the frame to be the president's leadership theory in use. In accordance with espoused theories, the president's theories in use could encompass more than one cognitive frame.

Following methods devised by Neumann (1991), cognitive roles were determined by coding responses to the questions "What role do you play on the leadership team?" and "How would you describe the role (your teammate) plays on the team?" In addition, references to the cognitive roles were further abstracted from the entire interview transcripts. In accordance with Neumann (1991), the researcher was concerned with capturing the images that team members have of the roles they and their teammates play. All transcripts of the presidents and team members were coded for references to the cognitive roles. If a person was mentioned by a majority of the team members as playing a particular role, the researcher considered that person to be the "primary" role player. Likewise, it was considered sufficient evidence for the identification of the cognitive roles if a person was mentioned at least twice as playing a particular role, and "weak" evidence if only one reference was made to a person playing a particular role.

The team functional domains were assessed by coding responses to the following three questions: "What are the role and most important functions of a leadership team?" "How do you find the team to be the most useful?" and "What makes your meetings important?" In addition, references to the functional domains were further abstracted from the entire interview transcripts.

Next, the transcripts were analyzed for themes within teams, and finally for themes across teams. Similarities and differences were identified within and among the three teams. The research questions were reviewed to ascertain that the coding scheme was capturing data to sufficiently answer the questions.

The final stage was to utilize peer review of transcripts and field notes to confirm or disconfirm that these data were accurately represented in the preliminary findings, and to strive for data exhaustion by identification of contrary data.

Team Observation

The researcher observed an actual team meeting in its naturalistic setting for each case. A Team Observation Checklist (Appendix D) and field notes were utilized to determine whether or not the cognitive roles were observed, whether or not the president's cognitive frame of reference was discerned, the level of the team interaction and communication, what issues were dealt with, how cognitively complex the team appeared, and whether or not the three functional domains of leadership teams were observed. Next, the researcher compared and contrasted how well observed team behaviors matched the descriptions of team behavior gained during the individual interviews.

Limitations of the Study

Not all community colleges have the same governance structure, culture, or presidential leadership; there are community colleges that have evolved more deeply into a participative governance model, while others adhere to a more bureaucratic model. These differences in institutional structure, culture, and leadership may limit the generalizability of this study to community colleges as a whole. An additional limitation could arise if the respondents selected for this study were not forthcoming or were hesitant to disclose information about the leadership team's dynamics. It was incumbent upon the researcher to establish trust and rapport with the respondents in order to elicit accurate data. Part of establishing this trust was adherence to high standards of ethics while conducting the interviews. The respondents were assured of complete confidentiality, the interviews were tape recorded to accurately reflect the gathered data, field notes were taken to accurately reflect researcher observations, and the researcher adhered to the rules and procedures established by the University of Kansas and the National Research Act. In addition, member checking and peer examination were utilized to validate results.

An additional limitation is the relatively small sample size, as only three institutions were selected for this study and only fifteen people were interviewed. A larger sample size could provide greater generalizability of the findings. Additionally, as the study was designed to take place in a naturalistic setting, the constraints of time and place produced a "snapshot in time" of each team, rather than a long-term ethnographic study. The extent to which data can be collected in two observations poses a limitation in the design.

Limited triangulation could also prove to be problematic. As the researcher was the only person to conduct interviews and observe the team meetings, which are the primary sources of data, investigator triangulation was not employed. Member checking, peer examination, and review by doctoral committee members provided limited triangulation.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to examine three presidential leadership teams in community colleges of similar size in order to answer the following research questions:

1) What are the characteristics and composition of presidential teams in community colleges?

2) How does the community college president's cognitive frame(s) of reference influence the team's functional domain(s)?

3) Are there any differences in the way members of the president's team perceive their participation in team leadership activities and the effectiveness of those activities?

4) How cognitively complex are community college leadership teams?

5) Are presidential teams in community colleges real or illusory?

Qualitative research methods were used to conduct an exploratory and naturalistic inquiry of presidential teams in community college settings. Through "thick, rich description," (Merriam, 1988) comparison, and portrayal, this multi-site case study attempts to offer the reader a realistic portrait, or snapshot in time of life within each team.

Three Midwestern community colleges of similar size were chosen for this study, each in a different geographic setting. Pseudonyms were given to each institution and those who participated in the interview process. Heartland Community College is located in a small community of 40,000 serving a rural four-county area, Great Plans Community College is located in the suburbs of a metropolitan area, and River City Community College is located in an urban area with a population of 144,000. Semi-structured on-site interviews were conducted with the three presidents and members of the presidents' leadership teams (a total of 12 persons across the three sites). Each team was also observed in a team meeting on-site, and a Team Observation Checklist was completed during the meeting to record observed behaviors and themes. Supporting documentation was collected in the form of a team survey, organizational charts, mission statements, position descriptions, and resumes in order to compile demographic data.

According to Bensimon and Neumann (1993, pgs, 81, 167), to classify a team as cognitively and functionally complex and therefore a "real" team, it must perform at least one useful function in each of the three functional domains and possess at least four of the five core cognitive roles. Analysis of the interviews and team observations focused on identifying references to four categories established by the researcher to answer the research questions and assess the teams' status as "real" or "illusory." These categories included the president's cognitive frame(s) of reference, the team functional domain(s), the five core cognitive roles, and the three supporting cognitive roles. Through a process of manually coding interview transcripts and field notes (see Appendix E), references to these categories were identified within each interview. These data subsequently were analyzed for the convergence and divergence of additional themes and categories, both within teams and across teams.

The results reported in this chapter include summation of the demographic data to answer research question number one, qualitative analysis of each case to answer research questions number two through five within each case, and qualitative analysis across cases to answer research questions two through five holistically.

Demographic Data

Tables 1 through 3 represent demographic data for each team collected through analysis of team surveys, documentation, and interview questions. The institutions and teams had a range of demographic characteristics as discussed below.

As seen in Table 1, there was some variation in the number of members of the leadership teams, number of college employees, fall student enrollment, and institutional type. Although each college was classified as a comprehensive community college, Great Plains Community College was part of a four-campus community college district. There was significant variation as to institutional setting, community population, and service area population.

TABLE 1

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA - INSTITUTIONS

Category	River City CC	Great Plains CC	Heartland CC
Institutional Setting	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Institutional Type	Single Campus	Multi-Campus District	Single Campus
Team Name	Executive Council	Dean's Group	President's Council
Team Members	4	6	5
Number of College Employees	329 FT, 223 PT	186 FT, 217 PT	285 FT, 120 PT
FL 96 Student Headcount	6,023	6,079	4,345
Community Population	144,266	46,396	39,970
Service Area Population	223,925	234,971	125,370

Table 2 illustrates that the three community college presidents were very similar in terms of age, gender, ethnicity, and years of experience in higher education. All three are Caucasian men, and their average age was 53. There was some variation in the highest degree earned, with two holding doctorates and one the M.B.A. The president holding the M.B.A., however, had the longest tenure in his position, the longest tenure at his institution, and the longest tenure in the field of higher education. Significant differences were found in the number of years of service in the current position and number of years at the institution, but all three presidents had considerable experience in higher education.

TABLE 2

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA - PRESIDENTS

Category	River City CC	Great Plains CC	Heartland CC
Age	52	56	51
Gender	Male	Male	Male
Ethnicity	Caucasian	Caucasian	Caucasian
Highest Degree	Ph.D.	M.B.A.	Ed.D.
Years in the Position	4	18	5½
Years at the Institution	9	25	16
Years in Higher Education	25	30	28

Table 3 provides demographic data about the 12 team members. Men outnumbered women two to one, and 84 percent of the team members were Caucasian. The mean age of all team members was 48. Forty-two percent held the doctoral degree, and the mean years in the current position averaged two and one-half years.

TABLE 3

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA - TEAM MEMBERS

Category	River City CC	Great Plains CC	Heartland CC
Team Composition	3 Vice Presidents	2 Deans 2 Associate Deans 1 Director	3 Deans 1 Associate Dean
Ages	48, 52, 56	42, 43, 49, 49, 49	41, 44, 45, 58
Mean Age	52	46	47
Gender	2 Male, 1 Female	4 Male, 1 Female	2 Male, 2 Female
Ethnicity	2 Caucasian 1 African-American	4 Caucasian 1 African-American	4 Caucasian
Highest Degree	2 Doctorates 1 Masters	2 Doctorates 3 Masters	1 Doctorate 3 Masters
Years in Current Position	1½, 3, 3 ½	1 ½, 2, 2, 2, 5	6 mos., 3, 3, 6
Mean Years in Current Position	2 ½	2 ½	3½
Years on President's Team	3, 3 ½, 8	1 ½, 2, 2, 2, 7 ½	6 mos., 3, 3, 6
Mean Years on President's Team	4¾	3	3½
Years at the Institution	3, 3 ½, 8	2, 2, 4, 6, 7 ½	6 mos., 3, 12, 17
Mean Years at the Institution	4¾	4½	8

Category	River City CC	Great Plains CC	Heartland CC
Years in Higher Education	3, 23, 28	4 ½, 5, 16, 24, 25	11 ½, 12, 17, 20
Mean Years in Higher Education	18	15	15

Significant differences were found in the teams' composition. The River City Community College team all held the title of vice president, while the other teams were composed of deans, associate deans, and a director. Even though River City Community College was fairly equivalent in terms of size, it appeared to have a more hierarchical structure than the other two colleges. A review of its organizational chart revealed that in addition to the three vice presidents, there were eight deans. Organizational charts for the other two colleges revealed a much flatter structure. The River City Community College team was also the smallest, and its members were slightly older than the team members of the other two colleges.

Case Studies

Each of the three following case studies will contain an analysis of the team's milieu, including background information on the college and the community it serves, the composition of the team, an overview of the structure of team meetings, and a brief overview of the issues the team has been dealing with during the past year. In addition, each case study will present an analysis of 1) the president's cognitive frame(s) of reference, 2) the team's functional domain(s), 3) the perceptions of team leadership and its effectiveness, 4) the team's cognitive complexity, and 5) the extent to which the team reflected the Bensimon and Neumann (1993) model of a complex or "real" team.

River City Community College

Team Milieu

River City Community College was located in a large Midwestern metropolitan area with a total population of approximately 2.5 million. River City's service area was two counties of the metroplex with a population of around 224,000. The college, founded in 1923, was the oldest community college in the state. Preparations were currently underway for celebration of the college's seventy-fifth anniversary.

The college served a diverse population. It currently enrolled 6,000 credit students and had around 550 full and part-time employees. Its president, Dr. Hart, had been with the college for eight years, and had served as its president for the last four. Prior to joining River City's staff, Dr. Hart had served as president of a smaller institution in the same state. His Executive Council consisted of three vice presidents--Fred Poindexter, vice president of academic services, Chuck Johnson, vice president of administrative and student services, and Roberta Coleman, vice president for executive services.

The vice president for executive services was a new position, created a year ago when the positions of dean of human resources and executive assistant to the president were merged into one. The person in this position was the only one with a limited background in higher education. Prior to joining the River City staff, the vice president of executive services had served 25 years in the public school system. Of the three vice presidents, two were white males and one was an African-American female. All team members, including the president, had offices within a few doors of each other. As a result, the level of communication among the team members was fairly high, as one team member described "daily, almost hourly contact with each other." Each team member stated that they often dropped into one another's offices to talk and touch base on issues. On occasion, the three vice presidents meet as a group to problem solve without the president in attendance.

Team meetings were held every Monday morning in the president's office. The president sat behind his desk and the three vice presidents were seated on a sofa or in chairs in front of his desk. Agendas were not sent out ahead of time, and in fact there was no written agenda. The meetings tended to be very open and informal, and minutes of the meetings were not kept. The president went through his agenda items first, then solicited items from each of the vice presidents. Team meetings usually did not have a time limit, and went on until all business was discussed. One team member described the importance of these meetings as where "we are talking about the heart and soul of the institution." The president was seen by the other team members as setting the agenda and having "much more control over what it is we are talking about."

The team meeting observed by the researcher was exactly one hour in duration. The president had the appearance of being rushed, and went through the agenda very rapidly. There was not much in-depth discussion of any one item, and the team managed to deal with approximately 15 agenda items in the allotted hour. The level of interaction among the three team members was minimal; most communication flowed between the president and individual team members. Agenda items did not generate very much discussion and no debate. The president spoke the most frequently, usually in the form of asking questions or giving opinions. As the president indicated that he goes through his agenda items first, it may be that these meetings were typically more utilitarian in nature with the president primarily giving or receiving information. Of the team members, the vice president of administrative services spoke the most frequently. The vice president of executive services appeared rather tentative in raising issues, and the vice president of academic services seemed to be left out of the discussion to some extent. Based on the interviews with the team members, this might have been a typical meeting in that it was short and to the point with little discussion. A common complaint of the vice presidents was that the president often canceled the team meetings. One team member also said that the president wanted them to "make it quick" when they met with him individually. Likewise, it was very difficult for the researcher to schedule this team observation, as meetings were canceled and not rescheduled for a period of time. In the end, it was not clear whether the team met to accommodate the researcher of if they met out of necessity.

The team had been dealing with several issues during the past year. A shrinking local economy coupled with a legislated budget lid had created financial pressures on the institution. As a result, the faculty bargaining unit had been unable to come to terms with the Board of Trustees on contract provisions since June of 1995, and had operated without a contract since that time. The current status of the faculty contract was still unsettled; they had moved beyond negotiations and were now into mediation and fact finding. This situation had created tension between the faculty and the administration, and had occupied a great deal of the leadership team's time during the past year.

President's Cognitive Frame Analysis

President Hart's espoused theories of leadership included both the political and collegial frames. As discussed in Chapter Two, in the political frame the president is a mediator and negotiator who administers through persuasion and diplomacy, is open and communicative, and sensitive to external interest groups (Bensimon, 1989). In describing good presidential leadership, he related:

> I think it's knowledge, familiarity with the institution and the community it serves, knowledge of the resources of the institution and the community...and to communicate to both the college community, that includes faculty, staff and students, and the community at large what the president's vision is in order that others may join and participate in reaching an agreement.

When asked what advice on team building he would give a new community college president, he said "I think...diplomacy is very important. Now if you are authoritarian, it is not nearly as important." Other advice he would give new presidents on how to build a team included:

> ...everyone has something important to bring to the team. You want to encourage openness. You don't want a bunch of 'yes' people around you. Respect the views of others, knowing that you are going to have conflicting views at some point in time and when decisions are going to have to be made, all ideas have merit.

Dr. Hart was very involved with the community, and served on several boards of community agencies. He indicated he had been concentrating his efforts in the economic development area, because "I believe that my involvement in the community there can have a direct benefit to the college." Communicating the mission of the college both externally and internally was seen as "one of the most difficult things for any community college president to accomplish." His team members indicated that Dr. Hart spent a lot of time in the state capitol "lobbying on behalf of the community colleges."

Presidents in the collegial frame seek participative, democratic decisions, consensus, and emphasize interpersonal skills and motivating others. In describing his relationship with the team, Hart indicated it is, "collegial...I don't try to dictate." Making decisions based on consensus was seen by the president as an important aspect of the team's operating style. Conflict in the team was handled by trying to resolve it at the time, by offering alternative courses of action, or engaging in a cooling off period. Hart stated that in order to function as a team, the president had to "be willing to let the team function and follow up on recommendations of the team." In enumerating strategies to keep a leadership team functioning effectively over time, he said "I think it is important that the team functions as equals" and "the president should not think that the president is above and beyond the team." He also felt strongly that "a president needs to be willing to admit that he or she makes mistakes if they have made mistakes."

Hart also appeared to use the symbolic frame as defined by Bolman and Deal (1991), where the rites, rituals, ceremonies, and heroes help propel the organization. His ability to use this frame might result as a natural outgrowth of his background as an historian. He related the history of the college during his interview, and during the team meeting gave his team a history lesson on the city in the early 1940s. He had obtained a 15-foot mural of an old plant assembly line for a company that resides in the city and several photographs of the college repertory company back in 1942 and 1943. He wished to have these photographs matted and framed for display on campus, and engaged his team in discussion as to the symbolism of their proper location. The president also engaged the team in discussing how to properly celebrate the college's upcoming seventy-fifth anniversary, and also the importance of honoring the Phi Theta Kappa awards recipients at an upcoming celebration.

Dr. Hart's espoused leadership theories were confirmed as theories in use by the members of his leadership team. One vice president said:

> I think he's a very effective team leader and I think he allows for open communication. He's non-judgmental which encourages us to be non-judgmental of one another. He encourages us not to be quite so hard on ourselves and not to take things personally...He expects us to bring information, make sound decisions, protect him and the board, and at the same time maintain the vision and work toward that vision...He

> doesn't raise his voice...And he listens to us...he almost never tells us what he thinks first.

Other team members described the president as "very open," "informal," "unassuming," "non-threatening," "easy going," and someone who "listens," and "allows us to voice our opinions" via "open communication." One vice president captures views held by the team of Dr. Hart's leadership when he described college governance before and after Dr. Hart's presidency:

> [Before Hart, college governance was]...top down kind of old school management...where there wasn't very much shared governance; there was a lot of conflict and grievances because of the resistance between the faculty and the administration and the board. I think that history established kind of the foundation that everybody wanted it to be better and everybody wanted it to be more open and more inclusive and, you know, ...empowering. So when Dr. Hart came in as president, he made an all-out effort to reduce that kind of tension by decentralizing a lot of the administration and control, and therefore he changed a lot of things around...One of the great things he did...was to make all college committees primarily faculty...He opened it up...to the shared governance approach. We are trying to build on that, make it even stronger so that everybody has a voice.

> We are trying to get away from that old top down totalitarian management system.

Team Functional Domain Analysis

The River City team performed useful activities in each of the three functional domains identified by Bensimon and Neumann (1993). When asked in what ways he found his leadership team to be the most useful, President Hart responded:

> There are probably several...In dealing with difficult situations...it has helped from this team where we are sharing ideas with one another and not just about our areas but about each other's areas--that we've made some decisions and are taking some action. I think the team has been much better than say me and the vice president for academic services just talking about instructional concerns or just the vice president for administrative services and I talking about fiscal plans...

Dr. Hart's response encompasses the utilitarian function (taking action and making decisions), the expressive function (dealing with difficult situations), and the cognitive function (sharing ideas with one another outside of assigned areas). He indicated that the most important function of the leadership team was in the expressive domain--communication. He saw it as three-way communication--communicating with him, communicating with the team members' constituencies, and communicating with each other.

The team responded to this question in a similar manner. Every vice president also mentioned communication as the role and function of a leadership team, including "communicating the message of the institution," "communicating with the entire college community," and "listening and hearing what the people are saying." One vice president, describing the cognitive function of the team, said:

> The benefit to the president would be that he'd get a much more broad picture than he would from his own eyes, and I personally value and I think he does, perspectives. And I realize that people bring different perspectives and I personally appreciate other perspectives, because I know I can only see with my eye, and I want to know what other people see and how they perceive things, and I know that that's [sic] not always the same as the way I do.

This same vice president, referring to the expressive function of the team, said of the president, "It also helps to know that he is not in this alone, and even at times we may disagree with one or more members of the team...that does not detract from or negate our positive perceptions of one another." The vice president also indicated that the team had a responsibility to the president, "to be sure that he keeps a finger on the real pulse of the college community."

The utilitarian function of the team was described the least often by the team members. When the utilitarian function was mentioned, it was primarily described as "dissemination of information," or receipt of information.

The team's operating style was described by the team members as open, informal, deliberately careful, and deliberately slow. The president was seen to have more control over the discussion, as he was the one who sets the agenda. People were not afraid to express their opinions or disagree and argue behind closed doors. The emphasis was on reaching consensus, and once decisions were made everyone publicly supported them.

Perceptions of Team Leadership and its Effectiveness

President Hart gave conflicting responses when describing the leadership team's effectiveness. When asked to assess the team a grade on their teamwork on a scale of one to ten, he responded "As far as the team is concerned, I would give it about a seven." He added "I think we could be much more effective." Yet, when assessing the overall effectiveness of the leadership team, responded "overall effectiveness, I think, is very good."

When the team members were asked to rate their teamwork, they responded "nine," "eight," and "beyond the middle point. I would give us at least a seven, maybe an eight sometimes but there are days when...we are down probably to a six." The vice presidents viewed their teamwork more positively than the president, overall, but still left room for improvement. One vice president said:

> ...to the extent that we support each other, communicate with each other, work together to achieve the same goals, I think we are a pretty good team...even those who disagree still support the team effort and what the team has decided. We don't work against each other. We don't try to undermine each other...We're a pretty good team; we could be better.

Another team member felt that the three vice presidents were a team "to a very, very large extent," but indicated that it would be to a lesser degree with the president included. A common theme that occurred throughout the interviews was dissatisfaction with the amount of time the president spent with his team. All three vice presidents mentioned that team meetings were often canceled so the president could attend to other concerns, usually involving political issues such as the community, the Board of Trustees, or the state.

One vice president said:

> ...we just don't meet often enough to keep our continuity flowing as well as it should...It seems like sometimes there are gaps in the times between meetings--it's sometimes too long

> and therefore you lose track of some things that still need to be discussed...

Another team member echoed this sentiment: "It concerns me when a meeting is canceled. That's a hint that something is more important than us meeting, and I don't think there is anything more important than that." Likewise, the other vice president indicated that "it's difficult for him to stick to having these weekly meetings." This team member also related that the former executive assistant to the president "doggedly reminded the president that we need to meet," a role that apparently had not been transferred to another team member.

In rating their overall effectiveness, two team members assessed a "nine," and the other said "....more than 50 percent effective--we can do several things better." One vice president hoped that the team would never reach a "ten," because "after a ten, I don't know what that would mean. Maybe we'd all become too much alike and you're no more a value as a team. As long as we never all agree, then we know we're okay."

The theme that emerged when the team members were asked what they got personally from membership on this team was a feeling of being valued and respected by their teammates. Each team member voiced very positive feelings about their teamwork, including this comment: "Maybe I live in a dream world here... I could probably very comfortably function within this team until I retired." Dr. Hart mentioned that a "feeling of worth" was an essential strategy in building a team, and also indicated that "the president should not think that the president is above and beyond the team." The importance of mutual respect in establishing positive team relationships was mentioned by every team member, in terms of respect for each other's opinions, respect for diversity of perspectives and backgrounds, and respect for the person. The team members seemed to genuinely get along very well. One vice president summed it up like this:

> We like each other, we support each other, we socialize together, we respect each others' privacy, we don't intrude on each others' lives but I think we all like each other as fellow professionals. We enjoy working together...

The quality of the communication within the team was also very highly rated by the team members, although one expressed a concern that sometimes things "leak out." One of the team members described a process they had gone through as a team to improve communication:

> ...we just talked about how we could all be more supportive of each other and keep each other informed and strive to make sure they were being accurate and concise in our reporting to each other...and that we would be better listeners and more supportive colleagues. There was a time when things were not

> quite as clear, as well communicated, as they could have been
> and we tried to overcome that.

In this team, conflict was acknowledged and dealt with. Team members were encouraged to talk about their feelings, air their differences, offer alternate courses of action, and then resolve the issue and move on. Sometimes the president engaged the team in a "cooling off period." All team members seemed to have a healthy attitude about conflict, even acknowledging that "we welcome conflict because I think you learn from it." When there was anger or hurt feelings, the team members described themselves as "very open minded and forgiving," and able to apologize when they got out of hand. Conflict did not seem to threaten team relationships, as they indicated that they respected each other and had trust in one another which allowed them to overcome anger or hurt.

Although this team seemed to be very forthright about dealing with conflict among the team members, there appeared to be an issue with canceled meetings and lack of team interaction that had not been addressed with the president. The president was apparently unaware of the message that frequently canceled meetings was sending to this team, as they reported feeling devalued and ineffective by the lack of interaction with him. The team members might have been reluctant to bring this issue forward or even couch this issue in terms of a conflict with their president, but it appeared to be a source of concern for every team member.

In describing the things that get in the way of effective teamwork, the president mentioned hidden agendas and "not effectively zeroing in on what the team is trying to accomplish." The team members mentioned not listening, lack of communication, and people not seeing things from the other person's point of view. Team members viewed strategies to keep a leadership team functioning effectively over time as regular meetings, open dialogue, listening, meaningful decisions, freedom to express their opinions and respect for the opinions of others.

Cognitive Complexity Analysis

According to Bensimon and Neumann (1993), the thinking roles making up the team's cognitive functioning may be fluid, shifting from one person to another from time to time, and may be shared by more than one person. In addition, one person may play any number of roles or no role. In order for a small team like the one at River City to be cognitively complex, team members would need to play more than one cognitive role. The River City team tended to conceive their roles in operational terms (the title of the position they hold) as opposed to thinking terms, making it necessary to use some follow-up questioning to elicit information. The evidence for the cognitive roles was rather sparse due to the fact that team members responded to the questions in operational terms; however, what was culled from the interview transcripts is presented as evidence. The personal interviews revealed that of the five core cognitive roles, all five were present and each team member played at least one role. Several times the team members indicated that every member of the team played a particular role. Taking into consideration the smallness of this team, that might have been true. What is presented as evidence, though, is only direct references to the key behaviors listed in Appendix E.

In the River City team, the role of the Definer was shared by all team members. Although the president called the meetings and provided the majority of the agenda items, all team members were asked to contribute to the defining of issues and building of the team's vision for the future. The president perceived his role as "facilitator, questioner, consensus builder, and then sometimes just plain decision maker."

The Analyst on the team was Roberta Coleman, the vice president of executive services, who was the only woman and the only African-American on this team. In part because of her background and in part because she supervised human resources, Roberta brought the ability to incorporate different perspectives into the team's thinking. One vice president said that Roberta "tends to have more of a global view" and "a lot of different points of view." In describing her role, Roberta said, "I may be more likely to bring a perspective different from the other three, and I do feel it's my responsibility to express that."

The role of the Interpreter was played by all team members. Each vice president was expected to bring a unique interpretation of the issues as seen through the eyes of those they represented. The president brought the perspective of the Board of Trustees and the community, and the three vice presidents brought forward the perspectives of the faculty, staff, and students.

The Critics on the team, as confirmed by team members, were Roberta Coleman and Fred Poindexter, vice president of academic services. Coleman indicated that she saw it as her responsibility to bring up the hard questions:

> I sometimes bring up the hard issues...there are hard questions sometimes that I have to raise, and I do that...So part of my role, I think, is to...raise issues that may actually be within the decision making realm of the other vice presidents, but to do that in a manner that will not have them feel that I'm usurping their authority, but rather that I'm attempting to assist.

Likewise, Fred Poindexter saw himself in a position where he "argued strongly" for his differing opinions:

> I will go in there and really argue strongly for more computers in the instructional areas, for more positions, and I am told that you can't, we don't have the money. Then I turn around and I

> see that they are going to hire another couple of custodians, and I say 'wait a minute.' I am always saying, 'if we have the money for this, why can't we do that? I think our priorities are wrong.' I've even told some of my colleagues that I think the person they are responsible for is not doing his or her job, and that we are using that position over there when we could be using that money for something else, and why don't we reorganize and change that and move that person to someplace where he or she can do a better job or outplace that person so we can use that item elsewhere.

The Synthesizer on this team was the president, Dr. Hart. One team member said of him "...he's a real diplomat...He listens, he lets you know your opinion is valued, and if he does not agree, you do not feel in any way depreciated." He was also described as "very good at presenting ideas and also mediating," "a good facilitator,"and "very good at processing things." In describing a difficult issue with which the team had dealt, one team member indicated that the president facilitated the final team decision by "synthesizing, sorting out, and considering ideas and approaches in order to come up with one coherent plan." As mentioned, Dr. Hart also saw his role as that of "facilitator, questioner, and consensus builder."

The research results showed that all three supporting cognitive roles were also present in this team. Again, evidence was culled from the interview transcripts.

The role of the Disparity Monitor was played by Chuck Johnson, the vice president of administrative services, and Roberta Coleman. When asked who on the team paid attention to what people outside the team thought about the issues, one team member indicated:

> Chuck stays on campus for lunch and goes down and has lunch with faculty and staff, and he picks up a lot of things in his lunches and discussions, and Roberta because of her personality, a lot of people feel free to go to her and tell her things and ask for things, or you know, drop little hints.

The team member also said that all of the team members "carry messages forward from things...we picked up from the grapevine that may be potential problems."

The Task Monitor on the team appeared to be the president. In reference to his expectations about their work, one team member said: "He wants the job done, and he wants it done well, and he wants it done right." Although the team's operating style was described as "careful" and "deliberately slow," the president kept the team on task by asking for progress reports and updates in the team meetings.

The role of the Emotional Monitor was played by Roberta Coleman. She alluded to a tense relationship between the academic vice president and the faculty and how that had negatively impacted contract negotiations. She offered herself as an intermediary because "I'd rather take the brunt for that than to have him out there on the firing line." She also said about Fred:

> I think Fred is very sensitive and intense...that's probably the word for it, he's intense. Most of the time, I think that he doesn't really want to rock the boat within this team, and sometimes things are not said that maybe ought to be said in the meetings by Fred, in order to ease some of the tension that can occur when a person is intense...

The President's Team as a Reflection of the Model

The River City Community College team met the criteria for functional and cognitive complexity as outlined by Bensimon and Neumann (1993). The team performed at least one useful function in each of the three functional domains, and possessed at least four of the five core cognitive roles. This team appeared to be cognitively rich, as it was possible to identify all eight thinking roles, although one person played four of the roles. However, what was observed during the team meeting did not necessarily reinforce this conclusion.

The president's primary cognitive frames were political/collegial, and he also demonstrated use of the symbolic frame. Even though he operated in a collegial fashion, his attentions are externally focused on the political environment. This attention to the external environment has prevented the team from fully realizing the benefits of their cognitive complexity, as the president apparently often canceled their meetings or rushed through their meetings. He wanted his team members to "make it quick" when they met with him separately.

The observation of the team meeting yielded a conflicting portrait from the one gathered during the interviews. Even though the president used the collegial frame, the meeting was held in his office while he was seated behind the desk. There was a conference room available near his office which would have allowed a much more inclusive seating arrangement. Most of the interaction flowed from the president to the team members and back, and there was very little lateral communication among the team members. The president did most of the speaking and raised most of the agenda items. He elicited agenda items from the team by going around the room and asking for them.

In observing body language and facial expressions, the president seemed tense or hurried and the team members ill at ease. This could be a result of feeling intruded upon, although the researcher sat unobtrusively out of the line of sight during the meeting. There was very little laughter or non-work related conversation prior to or during the meeting. One of the team members seemed to be somewhat excluded from the discussion during most of the meeting. Questions were seldom directed at this team member, although he did contribute two agenda items. The Emotional Monitor of the team mentioned in her interview her willingness to "take the brunt" for this individual when he had problems with the faculty. This type of lateral support among team members was indicative of a complex team, but it was not observed during this team meeting.

Although it is normal for every team to have a skeptic, virtually every team member at some time during the interview voiced a concern about the frequency of the team meetings and indicated that there were still several things the team could do better. In contrast, the president rated the overall effectiveness quite highly. These concerns and the difference in perception between the president and the team were all indicators of a simple team.

The president's perception also did not match the team's in the area of leadership. The three vice presidents saw the president as a *community college* leader at the state level, but did not see him giving credence to *team* leadership by virtue of his repeated absences from the team meetings. The president, on the other hand, viewed his leadership activities outside of the college as a direct benefit to this team.

According to Neumann (1991), team meetings are the settings in which the cognitive roles are enacted and the team's thinking is stimulated. Without these settings, there can be no enactment of the roles and subsequently no team thinking. It was discovered in this case that the three vice presidents had a higher need to meet than the president, and they have subsequently evolved as a team of three. Some team members rated their teamwork more highly without the president than they did with him included.

In terms of cognitive and functional complexity, this team fits the Bensimon and Neumann (1993) model. However, there were appearances of simple teamwork due to the fact that the team apparently did not meet often enough with the president to fully enact the thinking roles.

Great Plains Community College

Team Milieu

Great Plains Community College was located in the suburbs of a large urban area. It was part of a multi-campus community college district encompassing a nine county service area. Each college within the district had programs that were unique to that particular location. Great Plains, for example, was the automotive technology training site for the entire district. The service area of Great Plains was more difficult to define, as students throughout the district might attend any of the colleges, but five communities were included. According to district officials, this service area was approximately 235,000, roughly equal to that of River City Community College.

The college served a moderately diverse population. It currently enrolled 6,000 credit students and had around 400 full and part-time employees. The smaller number of staff than one would expect with an enrollment of its size is due to the centralization of several functions at the district level. The president, Vincent Craft, had been with the community college district for 25 years, and had served as the president of Great Plains for the past 18. His Dean's Group consists of John Franklin, dean of students, Kathy James, associate dean of students, Larry Washington, dean of instruction, Mike Parker, associate dean of occupational and continuing education, and Dave Smith, director of automotive technology. In terms of tenure at the institution, this was a fairly young team. Of the five team members, four had been with the institution two years or less. There were three white males, one white female, and one African-American male on the team. All team members, including the president, had offices within the same complex. As a result, the level of communication among the team members was very high, and they dropped in on one another frequently to touch base and discuss issues. In addition to their close proximity, the team took full advantage of electronic mail and voice mail as a means of further communication. The president was particularly fond of electronic mail as a means to respond to inquiries from the team.

Team meetings were held every Wednesday morning from 9 a.m. until noon in the president's conference room. The team sat around a large conference table with the president seated at one end. Although the president constructed the agenda, he solicited agenda items from all team members prior to the meeting. Agendas were rarely distributed ahead of time, but a written agenda was passed out at the team meeting. The agenda was divided into five predetermined categories--immediate decisions/concerns, personnel items, updates, discussion items, and future agenda items. Minutes of the meetings were taken, usually by the president, and were distributed the following week at the team meeting. The meetings began with a "warm-up," which was a shared responsibility of the team members. They took turns providing the warm-up each week, and it was up to the person assigned to come up with the topic for discussion. The purpose of the warm-up was to stimulate thinking and "get the team at ease," according to one dean. Topics could range from something humorous to an issue or concern of the team member. One team member gave an example of a warm-up as follows:

> If you were in my position and you had a faculty member who was experiencing some problem in the classroom, what suggestion would you give to that faculty member? And it could be something that I'm searching for an answer for, and I listen to each one of them as they go around and say 'I would

> tell the faculty member such and such and such.' And that in a sense will help me in terms of some of the ideas that I already have...

The team meeting observed for this study was two hours in duration. Although they normally met for three hours, this meeting was deliberately kept to two hours due to another engagement. The researcher was invited to come and sit at the conference table with the team, and at several points during the meeting the president stopped and either clarified a discussion item or gave further background information about the subjects to the researcher. The team members were extremely congenial and the level of interaction was very high. Agenda items generated considerable discussion among the team, and no team member was excluded or non-participative. The team members included one another in the discussion of all agenda items, and the president did more listening to the team than participating in the discussion. In addition to the observer, a guest was present from the district human resources office. The president explained that he was inviting different district representatives to attend the team meetings for the purpose of providing a district perspective about any pertinent issues. At this meeting, the district representative provided input into the process of evaluation of faculty.

Most communication flowed around the table laterally from team member to team member. The agenda items were presented in order, with the president's items interspersed throughout. The president seemed particularly adept at questioning and soliciting input from the team on the various agenda items. Several times during the meeting, Mr. Craft asked questions to elicit discussion, such as "What are the areas we need to improve?" "Who should have a voice in the decision?" "How should we proceed?" "Who should be involved?", and the final question of the meeting was "Are we missing something we should have talked about today?" During the interviews, some of the team members indicated that Mr. Craft used "almost a Socratic method" of questioning in his team meetings, and that was evident during this observance.

A major issue that the team had been dealing with during the past year was reorganization of the community college district. This reorganization had come about as the result of a change in district executive leadership. A new district chancellor and vice chancellor had been hired in the past three years, which had created a tremendous amount of change for all of the district colleges. In the past, the individual college presidents operated very autonomously with very little interference or directives from the district officers. Now, however, the chancellor was in the process of implementing a "horizontal structure and processes" which would span all of the colleges and dilute the individual identity they had enjoyed in the past. District-wide teams were being formed to deal with specific areas, such as instruction or buildings and grounds. Mr. Craft was in charge of the continuous quality improvement initiative for the district, and was known as the "CQI guru." Examples of processes that were being centralized included the production of the credit class schedule, which was now being combined into one document for the entire district. In the past, each college had its own schedule and own method of schedule distribution. There was talk of combining all of the college graduations into one, even though each college had its own individual identity with different colors, mascots, and logos. One team member expressed frustration on behalf of the students about the graduation scheme. He felt that his students identified with the Great Plains campus and would want to graduate there.

Despite the intrusion into their formerly-autonomous way of life, the president seemed to be handling it with aplomb. The researcher never heard him complain about the new structure or his district-wide responsibilities, he just acknowledged that there were "new realities of how the district operates." The president indicated that he had taken the leadership role by "opening up [my] uncomfortableness, [my] lack of comfort with what was going on in the process." He told the team he was confused and asked them what they felt. Together, they had developed a strategy to deal with what was happening. He served as the Interpreter of the new district directives and initiatives for his team, and this process had occupied a great deal of his and the leadership team's time during the past year.

President's Cognitive Frame Analysis

President Craft's espoused theories of leadership included both the collegial and political frames. Although his definition of good presidential leadership included a bureaucratic reference, "to provide the overall direction, the vision for the college, and to set the environment by which we can achieve these goals, and to provide a structure within which those can be achieved," his definition of "structure" was "some kind of a plan and some minimum set of rules by which we operate." There was no indication in his interview or in any of the interviews of the team members that this president ever exercised power and control in a bureaucratic fashion. Rather, he spoke of "gently guid[ing]" when providing direction: "We can help make decisions or gently guide the college," and "they let me know that they're going to do them, but by doing that, they're able to let me guide it ever so gently." This president seemed to take a very gentle hand with his team, and gave them great freedom and autonomy to do their jobs. He expressed the belief that:

> ...they probably would like more direction from me, but I don't like to do that, because I think that's their responsibility, within

> the overall parameters, to accept that direction for their unit...They would probably prefer that I would tell them a little bit more what to do.

Indicators of the president's collegial frame were abundant in the interview transcripts. As discussed in Chapter Two, in the collegial frame presidents seek participative, democratic decisions, consensus, and emphasize interpersonal skills and motivating others. Elaborating on his definition of good presidential leadership, Mr. Craft said:

> ...in order to be a good leader in this day and age, you need to be able to tap into the power that you have in your people, and somehow you have to create a situation where those people feel capable or comfortable sharing their ideas and implementing their good ideas...and giving them the freedom to do so. I think it's basically what we have done here at Great Plains...we give a lot of our power to deans and to other supervisors, and we try to support the people...

In describing his relationship with the team, Mr. Craft related, "As a team in a group I think they feel very, very comfortable with me. Don't [sic] have any problems letting me know that they think I'm wrong, or they think I ought to take some other kind of action."

In describing the team's operating style, the president indicated that "territorial boundaries" were not an issue, and that his team members were not "territorial types." Collegiality was also an attribute ascribed to the team members, in that "they involve their own staffs in helping shape what they're going to do and talking over how to do it." He felt the most important function of his leadership team was to be "supporters, coaches, and obstacle removers" in giving people the "freedom to propose options and planning steps they'd like to implement."

When asked what advice on team building he would give a new community college president, he responded:

> [Be] really, really confident that the person you hire has the capability to do their job...then getting them pretty clear [about how] the president would expect the college to go...then giving them considerable autonomy to get that done, and not micro-managing the operation.

He also indicated that important aspects of building a team included getting people together frequently so they could talk and listen to each other, setting an open tone with no hidden agendas, and engendering trust in the president. Mr. Craft reiterated these points when asked what strategies were necessary to keep the leadership team functioning effectively over time--frequency of meetings, letting the team know they are accomplishing and appreciated, and recognizing individual accomplishments in front of the team members.

This president's manner of dealing with conflict presented an interesting paradox. According to most of his team members, his method was not to deal with it. Almost every team member indicated in their individual interviews that the president was very uncomfortable with conflict, so he was shielded from it by the team. According to Mr. Craft, the team had been through team training and continuous quality improvement training, and felt comfortable bringing up concerns. At the same time, he said they usually were "working behind the scenes to resolve issues." When asked how the team handled conflict, he responded "they handle it themselves." Even though he had a strong collegial frame orientation and a desire for consensus, he was the Emotional Monitor of the team and was very concerned about people's feelings. He felt that it was important for the members of a leadership team to be "nice, considerate, thoughtful people." He might be uncomfortable, therefore, dealing directly with anger or negative feelings. Mr. Craft indicated that if he could see there was a disagreement between two people, he would ask the people to get together and talk, or the three of them would get together and talk about the issue. Apparently, disagreement between team members was not talked about in the team setting. However, when asked what gets in the way of effective teamwork, he responded "they're almost too nice to each other...so perhaps too tactful." In assessing a grade of their teamwork, he answered "I would say we're perhaps an eight. The only reason I say that is that it concerns me that we don't have stronger interaction with each other, so maybe everything is not being said that should be said." On one hand, the team was avoiding overt conflict because they believed the president was very uncomfortable with it, and on the other, the president was wondering aloud why his team was not saying everything that should be said.

In the political frame, the president is a mediator and negotiator who is sensitive to external interest groups. As discussed, Mr. Craft was very involved in dealing with political issues at the district level. He saw his role as being "sensitive to the politics--by that, I mean politics related to the sensibilities of dealing with other people in this district." Making sure that his college was merging with the chancellor's new vision for the district had been a concern for the past two to three years. Craft said, "At one time, we were very autonomous and very honestly we didn't really check with a lot of anybody else [sic], and we're trying to change that within the district to where we operate in a cooperative mode across our colleges." Working with the outside community was something that the president did mostly by himself. His service area encompassed five communities, and he was involved with their chambers of commerce, economic development councils, and the school superintendents of six school districts.

Mr. Craft's espoused leadership theories were confirmed as theories in use by the members of his leadership team. One of his deans described him as follows:

> Sometimes we talk about it and say Vincent comes across as a saint to people at times. He almost has too good of a reputation within the district, I think. Everybody wants to work for him. He's extremely patient, extremely supportive of this group. He's always very upbeat, works very hard...a lot of integrity...very caring...and I suspect some people might say too caring.

Other team members described him as the "conductor," the "navigator" who was "sensitive to our needs...always on focus...and always asking questions," and also added "he's very inclusive, he leads by example, he's encouraging to à fault at times...I've never heard him criticize." A team member also said, "Vincent really believes in operating as a team. He does not believe in top-down decision making. He really believes in the team concept of decision making." Other adjectives used to describe Craft included "patient," "supportive," "thoughtful," "careful," "cautious," "reflective," and "inclusive." When asked what contributed the most to the making of the leadership team at Great Plains, the team members unanimously said "the president."

Team Functional Domain Analysis

The Great Plains team performed useful activities in each of the three functional domains identified by Bensimon and Neumann (1993). When asked in what ways he found his leadership team to be the most useful, President Craft responded:

> They each have a different expertise and background. Most of it complimentary to mine and things that I don't have...They meet with people more...or they touch more people and give feedback on how people are reacting, or what problems or concerns they're having. They're very creative...and come up with good ideas...so they're kind of the eyes and ears and sensors...Collectively, we can help make decisions.

His response encompassed the utilitarian function (making decisions), the expressive function (the eyes and ears and sensors), and the cognitive function (different expertise and backgrounds, creating, coming up with good ideas). He indicated that the most important function of the leadership team was helping to develop the vision for the college and to communicate it to others, which are cognitive and expressive functions.

The team's response to this question included all functional domains. Expressive functions were listed the most frequently, such as "supporting one another," "communication," "collaboration," "cooperation," "celebration," and providing "a sense of belonging." Utilitarian functions included "accomplishing the mission," "making decisions," and "coordination." The cognitive functions were described the least frequently, and included terms such as "generating a variety of ideas and opinions," "synergy," and "creativity."

The team's operating style was described by the president and the team members as a modified version of the continuous quality improvement model; it was very open, relaxed, non-threatening, and laid-back, with no bickering or fighting allowed. It was expected that the team members would be very respectful of one another, and they were treated as equals and made to feel that they could safely tell things the way they saw them. They were decision and action oriented, liked to feel that they were moving forward, were deliberative, and listened to the concerns of others.

Perceptions of Team Leadership and its Effectiveness

President Craft expressed some doubt about the effectiveness of his leadership team. When asked to assess the team a grade on their teamwork on a scale of one to ten, he responded "perhaps an eight." As mentioned, he voiced a concern that the team did not have stronger interaction with each other. In reflecting, he responded, "I don't know that we're totally a team." He felt the team could be closer if the team members "delved a little bit more into the details of what was happening within their organizations or their group of people, and to collectively help each other with our problems."

When asked to assess the overall effectiveness of the team, he answered:

> On a scale of one to ten, I think we're only about at a six to seven, and what worries me, what concerns me is that I don't think we have totally become a team. We still have the president. It's hard to be a team member when you've got a president. My goal would have been for them to operate as a team that could run this college essentially without me, without reliance on me...I don't think we're there yet. I think that's partially because...all of them except John are relatively new to this team, and so they're still learning, a lot of how this district operates, and how they operate on an autonomous basis, yet work together as a team. So we're not there yet.

The team members rated their teamwork much more positively. Ratings included one "nine," three "eights," and one "seven." One team member qualified his rating with the comment "...again you have to remember, that's within the context of this team, and it's had a lot of new players, relatively speaking." Another team member indicated that, "we could still use some bonding." One dean responded "I think [we operate] pretty highly like a team...we rely upon each other and [we rely on] that team...I think Vincent tends to give us the signal that he regards it as being important, so I think that reinforces for us that it is important...and we in turn rely on it." Other team members felt that the team was sharing information, assisting and supporting each other in achieving goals, and putting forth a strong team effort. One dean assessed the overall effectiveness of the team as follows:

> I would say very effective and improving. I think we've primarily gotten through our learning phase. That has taken us a couple of years...I think we all know each other better now and are pretty comfortable...I think we're really at the point where we probably can begin addressing a lot better efficiency matters and...dealing with concrete issues outside of the learning mode.

Another team member felt that the team was the "best leadership team in the entire district...it's been very team oriented, it's not top down. Vincent shares information with us, critical information on district plans and goals."

A theme that emerged as a criticism of the team's effectiveness was the length of time that it took to make a decision. Every team member except the president mentioned it at some time during the interview. The slowness was attributed by some to the president's style of being extremely thoughtful, careful, and deliberate in his decision making. One team member said:

> I think we can improve by making decisions on a timely basis. I think we can come to a decision when we're reasonably sure that we have all the data, and I think that we prolong it...and it's

> a little aggravating and frustrating. And then again, those few times that we waited a little longer for that last piece of data, I said well, I'm glad that we didn't make a hasty decision because we would have missed that.

The team members also felt pressed for time in terms of their other obligations and responsibilities, both at the Great Plains campus and at the district level. In this multi-college system, the team members had obligations district-wide, which were seen as external forces that often impeded the progress of the team. As one team member said succinctly, "I can't be in two places at one time." Many felt that given more time, the team could be more effective and attend to more issues more rapidly. One team member expressed frustration that too much time was spent on some issues that "don't deserve all the time."

An additional concern was expressed about whether or not the team was raising all of the issues that needed to be brought up. A dean said, "Are we avoiding conflict because we don't like conflict?" Dealing with conflict appeared to be a sticking point for this team. All but one of the team members were in agreement that conflict was not dealt with in the team meetings. As one team member described it:

> It's not handled in that room, simply because Vincent does not acknowledge that there is a conflict. Everyone in the room knows that there's a conflict. Occasionally, if someone is really

> being vocal about an opposite opinion, he may just in his own way just shut him down. He might just talk over them and redirect the conversation, so that it's very clear that you're done talking. So, if there is a conflict, we will deal with it on our own out here, later on...Mike Parker and I, sometimes we do have conflict, and we both do a pretty good job...we'll have a little cooling off period, and then one of us or the other will come and say, 'you know about this morning I didn't mean to take that tone with you' or something...we just let it go.

Another team member felt that the president took an active mediation role, albeit a quiet one. He indicated that the president would step in at the time when he felt the discussion was getting to the stage of becoming a problem, but that he was not very quick to jump in. When he did mediate, he would ask, "How can we resolve this? or "Do you feel comfortable with this?"

The theme that emerged when the team members were asked about the quality of the communication within the team was that it may be the team's greatest strength, as well as a source of aggravation. Every member, including the president, praised the level of communication and described it as very open, of high level quality, and sometimes too plentiful. One member felt that sometimes the team had a tendency to "talk some things that aren't that significant to death." Another member referenced "beating things to death" in the team discussions.

The members of this team seemed to be a closely knit group. Although they did not socialize outside of the office, inside they had a fair amount of laughter, pleasant exchanges, and conversation. As their offices were located within a few doors of one another, it was easy for them to drop by and talk with one another. They felt valued, respected, and affirmed by their teammates, and described a sense of belonging and increased self-esteem as a result.

In describing the things that got in the way of effective teamwork, the team members mentioned hidden agendas, lack of trust, fear, losing sight of the total organizational goals, too much focus on each person's own unit, lack of a common vision, time pressures, and implementation of the new district horizontal structure. Conversely, strategies to keep a leadership team functioning effectively over time were identified as effective communication, encouraging and supporting teammates, constructive feedback, continuous improvement, regular meetings, an opportunity for fun or lightheartedness, getting together on a casual basis, continual renewal, leadership by example, an opportunity to reflect on larger issues, and commitment from the president to have a team.

Cognitive Complexity Analysis

The Great Plains team tended to conceive their roles in operational terms as opposed to thinking terms, making it necessary to use some follow-up questioning to elicit information. As a result, the evidence gathered for the cognitive roles was sparse; however, what was culled from the interview transcripts is presented as evidence. The research discovered that of the five core cognitive roles, all five were present and each team member played at least one role. Several times the team members indicated that every member of the team played a particular role.

President Craft was the chief Definer of the Great Plains team, although all of the team members also shared in the defining duties. The president was responsible for constructing the team's agenda, but all team members were encouraged to submit agenda items and bring their issues forward. One team member said, "I think his approach is to develop leaders out of all of us." The president agreed that all team members assisted in defining issues, but stated that he had the most experience and a better sense of where the district was headed, so he would be the primary person, "but only just by a little." He defined his role as "being sensitive to the politics" and helping "shape where we're headed."

The primary Analysts on the team were John Franklin, the dean of students, and the president. John was described as doing a "good job of seeing the big picture and understands the district political implication of decision making." John had considerable experience in the district and worked with other teams throughout the district. The president was described as always "looking from all angles." Several team members mentioned that these two work very well together in this role, as what one might miss the other would pick up.

The role of the Interpreter was played by the president, John Franklin, and Dave Smith, the director of automotive technology, who was particularly adept at projecting how student needs and industry needs would impact the issues. The president spent a lot of time in the community and brought the community perspective to the team. He felt it was his primary responsibility to "make sure that we're meshing with other folks." He also had 25 years of service with the district, and had a very good historical perspective about its operation. One of his team members stated that the role of the president was "to interpret the direction of the other presidents in a multi-campus operation...and the district's goals," and another said, "he always asks if anyone knows of anybody else outside of the faculty or any groups that might have differing opinions on an issue that might come up." John Franklin was described by a teammate as knowing "who 'might be offended by what' probably better than anybody else in that group." Referring to Vincent and John, this same team member said, "They've been around the longest. They know the most people. They know where the bodies are buried and all that stuff."

The role of the Critic was played by every member of the team, including the president. Larry Washington, the dean of instruction and the only African-American on the team, said that he brought up issues related to minorities that were somewhat uncomfortable for the others to raise "because they do not know how." Likewise, Kathy James, the associate dean of students and the only female on the team, was seen as the person to raise issues related to gender. Kathy described herself as "go[ing] around and around" debating issues with Mike Parker. Mike Parker, the associate dean of continuing and occupational education, and Kathy James were seen as particularly good at asking "why" questions. Dave Smith would question whether or not current policies really serve students' needs. John Franklin and the president were also seen as Critics by the team members, again due to their longevity with the district. One member said, "The president is always critiquing. 'Have we done all that we possibly can do? What else can we do?' I think that's his whole makeup...that we look at it and we critique it until it is perfect."

According to the team, four of the six team members were reported to play the role of Synthesizer--the president, the dean of students, the dean of instruction, and the associate dean of occupational and continuing education.

The most evidence for this role comes from John Franklin, who saw himself as follows:

> I think that I'm a pretty good listener and processor...I have a good ability to balance, to listen to what people are saying and after listening to what is being said, sometimes being able to get us back on target or back on track by simply repeating what I'm hearing people say, 'is this and is that correct?' And I tend to use that a lot to try to find out...whether or not we do have agreement.

John also pointed out Larry Washington's facility with this role, and said, "Larry will tend to hold back and I think oftentimes reflect on what is being said and many times comes up with a summary statement that well expresses the issue that's at the heart of what we're talking about." Another team member described the president as a person who, "takes all of the information that we are able to give, and really uses that to help him make his decision...you believe that you have been heard and that your opinion has counted in his decision making."

The research results showed that all three supporting cognitive roles were also present in this team. References to these roles culled from the interview transcripts are presented as evidence.

The role of the Disparity Monitor was played by Dave Smith and the president. Dave was seen by the team members as having "a pretty good idea of what the student voice would be." The president paid considerable attention to the role of the Disparity Monitor, but relied on his team to keep him informed about what people were saying. He served directly in that role in his dealings with the community and the district, but when it came to students, faculty and staff, a team member said he "always asks...if anyone knows of anybody else outside of the faculty or any groups that might have different opinions to [sic] an issue that might come up." Another team member, describing an issue with which the team dealt, said "the president['s] concern was that we want everyone to be pleased with the outcome, and involved, of this decision making process."

The role of Task Monitor on this team was played by two people--the president and John Franklin. Both were seen by the team as the people who "keep us on track" or "get us back on track." The president was also described as the "conductor," and the person who is "always on focus."

The primary Emotional Monitor of this team was the president. As previously discussed, the president was uncomfortable with open conflict. One of his team members said that he "will tolerate hostility or anger for so long" and that one of the primary criteria for making decisions was his consideration of an individual's desires. Another described him as very sensitive to the concerns of others. Other team members were also cited in this role, particularly due to their use of humor. Kathy James was "able to raise the questions directly with a light manner...and usually gives us a good chuckle and sort of stops us...there." Dave Smith "has a good sense of humor, and oftentimes helps to keep things light."

The President's Team as a Reflection of the Model

The Great Plains Community College team met the criteria for functional and cognitive complexity as outlined by Bensimon and Neumann (1993). The team performed at least one useful function in each of the three functional domains, and possessed at least four of the five core cognitive roles. This team appeared to be cognitively rich, as it was possible to identify all eight thinking roles, and all team members were able to play more than one role.

The president appeared to be unique because according to the team members, he was able to play and did play every cognitive role on this team. This may be due to his extensive experience with the community college district, and his lengthy tenure as the president of Great Plains. He undoubtedly knows the community, the political environment, and district operations better than anyone else on this team. Although he played every role from time to time, the president appeared to be very comfortable in sharing the cognitive responsibilities with his team. This is evidenced by the fact that almost every role was played by more than one of the team members, and in some cases all of the team members.

The president's primary cognitive frames were collegial/political. He sometimes used the bureaucratic frame when describing roles or functions, but all of the evidence gathered from his team members indicated that there was virtually no bureaucratic behavior in terms of exercising power and control. It may be that in the past, the president used a primary bureaucratic frame, but through the years has changed his orientation to encompass a much more collegial style. However, the president was currently dealing with the bureaucracy of a district-wide reorganization, and had to use the bureaucratic frame to deal with the district's executive leadership. The summation of his interview also indicated that his bureaucratic frame was still in use. When asked if there was anything else he'd like to say about the team, he responded:

> I guess I would have to say that I don't know that this is the best way. It appears to me to be very good at surfacing creativity and getting people involved and getting buy-in by everyone within this college. It appears to me weak from the standpoint of accomplishing quickly some pre-set goals we might have or the chancellor might have. It seems to me that when you give that much freedom and autonomy to people, they might not necessarily do what you or the chancellor had in mind that was

> priority number one. On the other hand, they might deal with issues and invent things that are much more important in the long run that our leadership group hadn't thought about. So I'm not convinced that the way we have done it is the best way. It has worked for us, but....

The observation of the team meeting confirmed the evidence gathered during the interviews. The meeting was very open and generated a great deal of discussion from all team members. Most communication flowed laterally, and no one dominated the discussion or was excluded. Team members seemed to speak more frequently than the president. The atmosphere of the meeting was relaxed and punctuated by laughter. The president's "Socratic method" of questioning was observed in the meeting, as he repeatedly asked for input, feedback, and summation. Team members appeared to genuinely like one another, felt very comfortable being observed by an outsider, and attempted to include the researcher in the meeting by explaining the background of some discussion items.

The most consistent theme that emerged in the Great Plains study was the president's discomfort in dealing with conflict. One team member expressed concern about it that reflected the views of others when saying, "If you don't let conflict and differences of opinions emerge, then you don't even really find out what issues need to be dealt with." This style of dealing with conflict can inhibit the "surfacing of creativity" that the president desires and impinges on the team's effectiveness. Likewise, Bensimon and Neumann (1993, pg. 130) assert that "real teams must acknowledge and address even the most subtle conflict, and team builders must attend carefully to interactive processes within the group and to...perceptions and feelings about them."

Heartland Community College

Team Milieu

Heartland Community College was located in a small Midwestern community of approximately 40,000. It served a rural four county area with a population of around 125,000. The college was founded in 1928, and was one of the oldest community colleges in the state.

The college served a minimally diverse population, but through its strong athletic and educational programs attracted a moderately diverse student body. It currently enrolled 4,400 credit students and had around 400 full and part-time employees. Its president, Dr. Bob Edwards, had been with the college for 16 years, and had served as its president for the past five and one half. Prior to accepting the presidency, Dr. Edwards was the college's dean of continuing education. His President's Council consisted of four team members--Susan Barnett, the dean of instruction, Paul Nelson, the dean of student services, Cindy Laird, the associate dean of continuing education, and Robert Reed, the dean of finance and operations. All members of this team were Caucasian; two were males and two were females. This team was the only one in the sample to achieve a balance of genders, although it lacked ethnic diversity. The dean of instruction was a new hire and had only been with the college for six months. Edwards' team had been at Heartland for an average of eight years, but had only served an average of three and one-half years in their current positions. Heartland had a strong propensity to hire from within, as the president and two team members were promoted through the ranks. One team member said, "We're not really crazy about you if you look too different from us."

The team members did not have offices in close proximity of one another. Three of the five were located in the same building, while the other two were in a different building. As a result, it was not as easy for them to communicate face-to-face on a daily basis as it was for the other teams in this study. However, they made extensive use of electronic mail and voice mail to keep in touch with one another. One team member said that the weekly team meeting might be the only time during the week that she got to see some of the team members.

Team meetings were held every Tuesday morning from 8:30 a.m. until 11:30 a.m. or noon in the president's office. The team sat around a large conference table with the president seated at one end. There was no written agenda, but occasionally the president would send out an electronic mail message asking the team to be thinking about an issue prior to the meeting. The operating style of the team was very open and informal, and the proceedings were kept by the last person who arrived for the meeting. The president laughed when he related that custom, and said, "it doesn't count if you just throw your notebook in here either." The president did not feel that these proceedings qualified as minutes of the meeting, although the team members referred to them as "minutes." Proceedings were distributed via electronic mail to the team members following the meeting. The president usually went through his agenda items first, then solicited items from each of the team members.

The team meeting observed by the researcher was three hours in duration. Team members seemed to be truly enjoying the meeting and their interaction with each other, as there was a fair amount of laughter all around the table consistently throughout the meeting. Agenda items generated considerable discussion and some debate among the team members. No team member was excluded or non-participative, although the two deans spoke the most frequently. In addition to the observer, two guests were brought into the meeting--the director of institutional research and the director of public relations and information. After these individuals presented their reports to the team, they were excused from the meeting.

The president convened the meeting and went around the room to solicit agenda items. As the team provided the majority of the agenda items, the president did more listening than talking. Most communication flowed laterally from team member to team member.

Over the past year, a new directive from the Board of Trustees to better serve business and industry had occupied a great deal of the leadership team's time. The college had been charged by the board to create some change in how courses are delivered and packaged to better meet these needs. As the faculty at Heartland operated under the terms of a master agreement that was negotiated yearly, it had been difficult to institute needed and desired change. One team member said, "As an administrator, you have to just about carry that thing in your back pocket. If you want to try anything new and different, you have to think how it would be affected by the master agreement." The challenge of implementing these changes had fallen primarily on the new dean of instruction. She explained:

> There's a lot of expectation there for results, although they certainly understand what the barriers are and some of those things are starting to surface. My honeymoon period is clearly over, because now we're talking about the changes to be made. I guess at times my frustration is that we all know what needs to

> happen and we all know that it's going to be uncomfortable, but we need to move on.

The president indicated that the dean had the complete support of the team on these issues, and that the team had provided input as to how to best approach the desired changes. He summed it up by saying "We're here to help one another. I think that's what the teamwork is all about. All of us will have awful things happen throughout the year that we have to deal with, and this group provides support."

President's Cognitive Frame Analysis

President Edwards' espoused theory of leadership was primarily in the collegial frame. In the collegial frame, presidents seek participative, democratic decisions, consensus, and emphasize interpersonal skills and motivating others. Elaborating on his definition of good presidential leadership, Dr. Edwards said:

> I think leadership, to me, means working with other people and trying to solicit as much information, knowledge, input, talent as you can from everybody in the work environment to better the institution. I think leadership means accessing the talent that's available in the institution and taking all those human resources that you have to try to benefit the institution.

When asked what advice on team building he would give a new community college president, he responded from the collegial frame:

> Bring people in. I think what you basically have to do is maybe have some discussions on the safe problems...If you start out with those safe topics, then everybody can get a sense as to who they are and who they aren't and what their role and contribution will be and that their contribution will be heard. That you're heard not just by the president but by everybody else in the room. And everybody else in the room will come away different because of the ideas and suggestions that they share. Knowing that their input is significant and is paid attention to. I think that's absolutely essential.

Asked to describe his relationship with the team, Dr. Edwards responded, "These are people I would trust my life with." Conflict in the team was dealt with directly, as the president indicated, "I'm a direct person." He elaborated that the team usually talked through their differences, and if they were unable to resolve the conflict, they would go back and gather more information or "do what we can to shore our position to change my mind or to change someone else's mind." Edwards indicated that he was "not one to mince many words and most of the respondents are the same way." Likewise, when the president was asked what he did to make sure every voice is heard, even opposing ones, he answered, "This group will be heard. I don't think anyone is just going to sit back on an issue. If they do then I guess it's my fault." The strategies the president felt were necessary to keep a leadership team functioning effectively over time included, "to allow those to create an environment where new ideas can spring forward...to foster an environment where new ideas will bubble forth...I think that's really the way to keep things going to keep the enthusiasm, interest, and fun."

President Edwards also espoused a bureaucratic frame. He described the role and most important functions of the leadership team as:

> ...bring[ing] the areas that they represent to the table, bringing their issues, their needs, and their suggestions as to how their area can take the institution closer to fulfillment of the mission. I think what they're doing in here is representing particular areas.

In the bureaucratic frame, the president emphasizes organizing, setting priorities, making orderly decisions, and communicating via established lines of authority. Viewing his team in operational terms, as representatives of particular areas, is indicative of the bureaucratic frame. According to Bensimon (1989), it is unusual to have the paired frame of collegial/bureaucratic. It may be that Edwards used the bureaucratic frame to temper his collegial frame, or it could be a frame that he was in the process of de-emphasizing as he grew more comfortable in the presidency.

Dr. Edwards' espoused leadership theory was confirmed as a theory in use by some members of his leadership team. One team member said, "I think he's very good about communicating that vision and getting feedback on how that's going to affect our people or if there are any suggestions that we might have." Another team member responded:

> He wants our support...He doesn't pretend to have the answers...not overbearing...wanting to promote collegiality...wanting to be supportive and empathetic to each of us. He really has tried to teach us that if you go off on some direction how does that affect everyone else at the table.

Other team members, in describing the president as a team leader, spoke more of a bureaucratic orientation. One team member felt that Dr. Edwards was well into the process of learning to become a leader, and expressed hope that this process "will take him a little further in allowing for the deans to carry out the responsibilities that they have been given and the authority they've been given to do that. It might even make his job easier." He was described as a "hands-on president" and one who needed to be kept apprised and advised of the things that are going on in the various areas. "He does that by being more of a hands-on [sic] and watching what's going on and being involved in each area."

said one team member. Another responded, "He has an expectation that when he tells you in council or tells you anywhere he feels like this needs to happen, that you're going to go out and make it happen." Other comments included, "People might say he will micro-manage and he does sometimes," and "It's hard for him to delegate."

All team members agreed that Dr. Edwards was a "tireless worker." One said, "I would challenge you to find a harder working president anywhere." It was not unusual for the president to work from early in the morning until late in the evening and on weekends and holidays. A team member expressed a concern that "I don't see a lot of balance in Bob's life." His leadership style was also characterized as "...hard work, service orientation, delivering quickly with quality and without exception. So his style as leader is that he models all those attributes."

Team Functional Domain Analysis

The Heartland team performed useful activities in each of the three functional domains. Ways that the president found the leadership team to be the most useful included "...sharing their expertise, their knowledge and their perspectives. Everyone has a unique perspective." This statement both demonstrates his collegial frame and describes the cognitive function of the team. He also indicated that he could not think of a "least useful" function for the team. He said, "They work together as a unit. They share a lot of ideas and thoughts. They are very important and critical to the institution in everything they do." The main purpose of his meetings with the team was described as "communication" (the expressive function), and that the role and most important functions of the team were "to bring the areas that they represent to the table...and their suggestions as to how this area can take the institution closer to fulfillment of the mission" (the utilitarian function).

The team's response agreed with the president. The expressive functions were mentioned most frequently, and included "support," "a level of trust," "buy-in to the vision," "sets the flavor of the institution," "collegiality,"and "an opportunity to take care of the dirty laundry without having it publicly aired." Cognitive functions mentioned were "different perspectives," and "an honest exchange of ideas." The utilitarian function was mentioned the least frequently, and was referenced as "being a representative of your particular group."

Interaction, collaboration and camaraderie were seen as important aspects of the team meetings by the team members. Team meetings were seen an opportunity to share frustrations, give and receive information, and provide a "safe haven" where team members could get away from the phone calls and hassles of administrative work.

There were several "unwritten rules" for this leadership team, and the one mentioned most frequently was to keep Dr. Edwards advised and informed of all activities. The president did not like to be surprised or "blind sided" by "something that was said or done at a meeting that he did not attend." One team member said "...if you're not going to put your heart and soul into the institution and work your rear off you're not going to be accepted at some level...There has to be a tremendous amount of commitment." The newcomer to the team said, "...timing is everything...not to get too hurried about getting to the cut and chase because people need that process. And not to take this personally."

The theme that emerged when the team members were asked what contributed the most to the making of their leadership team was the importance of mutual trust. Regular meetings, an initiative to increase communication, and a desire for the team approach were also mentioned.

Perceptions of Team Leadership and its Effectiveness

President Edwards was the most positive of the three presidents in this study in describing the effectiveness of his leadership team. When he was questioned about this topic, he answered quickly and did not need to equivocate or elaborate. He rated the team a "ten" on teamwork, and responded "I think we're a real team." Edwards assessed the overall effectiveness of the team as "excellent."

The team members were not quite as positive as their president, but still rated their teamwork highly; ratings included one "seven," one "seven to eight," and one "eight." One team member summed up the team's perception as, "I think to a very strong extent [we are a team]...I would assess that this is probably the strongest team I've ever been on. I feel a very strong sense of belonging and that we're unified." One team member gave the team grades of "A in team dynamics, an A- in vision, and a C+ to a B- in achieving total institutional change." Other team members indicated, "I think we do a super job," and "we're pretty darn effective."

Asked if he had any concerns about the way team functions, the president responded, "No, I don't. I'm just thrilled to have this caliber of people." Team members expressed concerns about the team's functioning, but each had a different concern. One was concerned about getting "bogged down in history and process" and discussing things too much; one felt that the team was reactive instead of proactive; another was concerned about maintaining trust and "that we recognize and allow for the authority and responsibility that each one of us has been given to be carried out by that person," and one felt that the president was "basically suspicious of everyone." One team member expressed concern that the team did not "spend enough time on the politics of change." Elaborating, the team member said:

> We make an assumption that the level of communication that is taking place on that team is taking place in other groups on the campus. Therefore, we probably don't carefully enough politic

> the changes that need to take place...So my point is that even though our team functions well and there's a significant amount of communication, we may not politic some of these issues as well as they should be politicked because down the road we may be dealing with a backlash... Somebody's not fulfilling their role.

Earlier in this case study, the manner in which the president handled conflict was explored. From the standpoint of the team, their reality matched that of the president. Conflict did not seem to be a significant issue within this team, because it was dealt with immediately and in a collegial manner. All team members reported that when a conflict arose, the president would "get it on the table and we talk about it as soon as we possibly can. He won't even let it go until the next day if possible." The process of solving the conflict might take some time, but acknowledging the conflict and discovering the root of the problem was handled quickly. One team member described a cognitive process of looking at all sides of the problem to reach a resolution and consensus. Occasionally, two people would get together and "try to figure out how we can compromise." Overall, conflict was handled openly within the team.

The members of this team seemed to be a closely knit group. They unanimously agreed that they get along "very well." Three or four times a year they get together socially, either for a barbeque at the president's house or a picnic. They viewed one another as a source of support and their meetings as a "sanctuary where you can go and just sort of let your hair down." They felt acceptance, care, and compassion from their colleagues, and reported feeling a great deal of satisfaction from membership on the team. The team has also provided them an opportunity to learn and an opportunity to look at things from a larger perspective.

The quality of the communication within the team meetings was very highly rated by the team members and the president. Two team members expressed a concern that communication outside of the team meetings could be impaired by busy schedules. One expressed a concern that "there is very little time that we are able to spend informally." The other team member said:

> We use e-mail a lot. Sometimes I think we use it too much. We probably need to do more one-on-one interaction than we do. Quite frankly, that once a week is probably the only time that maybe I'll interact with Paul on a regular basis...The thing is that we're just so overwhelmed with meetings. I wouldn't even suggest that we need to do more meetings. We just get caught up sometimes and the communication suffers when you get so busy. We have a real open dialog within our meetings. If the

> communication sometimes lags I think it's just a function of being so busy and not a function of not sharing.

Communication was seen as very important to this team. A team member said:

> I think the quality of the communication within the team is not totally apparent in the meetings we have each week. I think the communication we have with each other permeates the whole week. We have open communications with each other. If we have a problem or situation of any kind or a proposal we have communication lines open--by telephone, by e-mail, whatever, all the time. That's probably one of the things that the president and each one of us push more than anything else. We must communicate with each other all the time.

As presented earlier, the president felt that communication was the main purpose of the team meetings.

In describing the things that get in the way of effective teamwork, the president mentioned personal agendas and "losing sight of the institution." He stressed that it was not an issue with this group. He also indicated that "you've got to have complete trust. If you don't have trust it just destroys the chemistry." The team members also mentioned personal agendas and lack of trust, as well as lack of time, outside stresses, unethical behavior, lack of focus on the vision, and weak people as things that get in the way of effective teamwork. These issues and behaviors were not observed within this team, but team members with longer tenure indicated that some had been present in the past with team members who were no longer at the institution. Team members viewed strategies to keep a leadership team functioning effectively over time as trust, expressing appreciation to one another and receiving a "good pat on the back or a thank you," celebrating accomplishments, recognizing that people have a personal life and that there is interest in them as a person, some turnover in personnel to keep the team from stagnating, supporting one another, maintaining a safe environment, working together as a team, not taking things too seriously, listening, feedback, and a method of rejuvenation or a way to prevent burnout.

Cognitive Complexity Analysis

The Heartland team was particularly insightful in describing the roles of the various team members. Two of the team members had backgrounds in social work and counseling, and understood that the term "role" did not refer to operational position. As a result, the evidence gathered for the cognitive roles was somewhat richer than that culled from the other two teams. The research discovered that of the five core cognitive roles, all five were present and each team member played at least one role. Several times team members indicated that every member of the team played a particular role, specifically that of Definer, Critic, and Interpreter.

President Edwards was the chief Definer of the Heartland team, although all of his team members shared in the defining duties. He indicated that he gave "some sense of institutional direction and some issues we need to keep on our agenda as far as taking steps to fulfill the institutional mission." Susan Barnett, the dean of instruction and newest team member, was described by a teammate as a Definer who "if we were all in a forest she is at the front hacking at the bushes trying to move on through."

The primary Analyst on the team was Paul Nelson, the dean of student services. In describing him, a team member said, "He comes from that mediation background and he looks at all the angles and takes the personal stuff out of it and looks at the process." Also sharing the duties of the Analyst was Robert Reed, the dean of finance and operations. One team member said of him "Robert's probably the most willing to examine other perspectives of any of the business managers that we've had...He's the realist, I suppose." The self-described Analyst was Cindy Laird, the associate dean of continuing education. She said:

> I am typically the one who is interested in politics and how things play out at the state department or with the legislature. I think I'm the one who most often will say 'we need to meet

> about this' and 'there needs to be discussion' and 'who needs to be at the table'...You bring together the parties and then you have a meeting of the minds."

The role of the Interpreter was primarily played by the president. One team member said, "We pretty much rely on Dr. Edwards to help us decide what should be presented to the public and said to the public." Dr. Edwards indicated that:

> I think that I can also bring some community perspective to the group as well because of my previous job and longevity in the role as well. I've got a pretty good sense as to what community perspectives are...I think that is critical.

The president felt that it was important for every team member to share in this role, as "they each have their own constituencies they can monitor." Paul Nelson also shared interpreting duties. He said "...often I play the role of historian and bring to the table the ways things used to be." A teammate described how important Paul's perspectives were to her in her role, particularly, "...his perspective from the historical standpoint, which I really need."

All team members at one time or another played the role of Critic, however one was mentioned the most frequently. Susan Barnett was described as:

> ...looking into the future with an eye to the needs of the community much better than I've seen most anybody else do. She is able to come back and tell us what needs to be done and how to do it. Not only does she present the problem that has to be solved, but also a way to solve it.

Another team member described her as the "innovator and the lawyer in that the person that represents a clientele and argues a case for that particular clientele."

The primary Synthesizer on the Heartland team was President Edwards. One team member said he has:

> ...worked really, really hard to have people into his office to discuss things and talk about all different groups and have employee meetings and trying to make sure everybody is communicated with. Dr. Edwards has worked really hard to communicate better with all constituents on campus and get feedback from all of them before final decisions are made.

The research results showed that all three supporting cognitive roles were also present in this team. Again, evidence was culled from the interview transcripts and in some instances there might have been only been one reference attributed to a person acting out a particular behavior.

The evidence for the role of the Disparity Monitor was rather weak. The president described two team members' roles in representational terms, such as that of Paul Nelson. The president said he "represents the student perspective and the student concerns...he brings the students' interests to the table..." Cindy Laird also was described as a representative, as she has:

> ...contact with those special communities that we serve...When she comes in she's going to talk a lot about the non-traditional student and the particular needs that student has...and she'll also represent the interest of the part-time instructors.

The role of the Task Monitor was shared by four team members. One team member said the president "has assumed the role of checker. 'This is an expectation, what's going on.' 'Why is it or why is it not going on.' Also, the role of do it faster and better." The team related that the president worked "80 hours a week" and had high expectations that his team members would also work very hard. One team member said, "I think we all recognize that the task orientation is there." A team member described Robert Reed, the dean of finance and operations, as "the task master" and "the fiscal man" and another one said "I think Robert wants to be in control of the finances." Cindy Laird also ascribed this role to herself. She said, "I get the details done. Bob paints the sky blue and the grass green and then he doesn't worry about the details. So I come in and fill in the details." Cindy Laird and Paul Nelson were also the ones on the team who paid attention to process. With their backgrounds in social work and counseling, issues of process were of utmost importance to them. One team member said Paul's attention to process had been "good for me because...I'm not really into process."

Cindy and Paul were also two of the Emotional Monitors on the team. Again, with their backgrounds in social work and counseling, they naturally gravitated to this role. Cindy said, "Paul's sort of a hero, a mender. I think that's probably that counseling thing. He's like me in that he doesn't care much for conflict. I'm not a big conflict person." Paul also described himself that way: "Quite often I'm in the counseling role. I sometimes play the role of mediator in certain issues." Cindy indicated that:

> sometimes your role needs to be one of the humorist. Sometimes Bob can get terribly serious..[so I say] 'Come on guys, we're not dying and no one is bleeding on the highway.' So sometimes I have played that role and on purpose because the sun is still going to come up tomorrow.

One team member indicated that the president often played this role:

> He has been extremely supportive of me and what I've tried to do. And he's been very sensitive. He's probably more concerned about me personally and how that's affecting me. You don't find a lot of presidents like that. You really don't.

The President's Team as a Reflection of the Model

The Heartland Community College team met the criteria for functional and cognitive complexity as outlined by Bensimon and Neumann (1993). The team performed at least one useful function in each of the three functional domains, and possessed at least four of the five core cognitive roles. This team appeared to be cognitively rich, as it was possible to identify all eight thinking roles, and several team members had the ability to play more than one role.

The president's cognitive frame was collegial. He has a bureaucratic orientation in his attention to tasks, and most team members felt that he micro-managed them at times. He was an extremely hard working president, and was described as "Heartland's best cheerleader." One team member said, "He just really loves this place." His fondness and respect for his team was also quite evident, as he spoke of them in glowing terms and said, "these are people I would trust my life with," and "I'm just thrilled to have this caliber of people." Although the president played the roles of Definer, Interpreter, Synthesizer, Task Monitor, and Emotional Monitor, all of those roles were also shared. He was not only very comfortable sharing these roles, but expected his team members to share them, and gave them a great deal of credit for the unique strengths and perspectives that they brought to this team.

It appeared that this president had made a deliberate effort to change his cognitive frame or lens. A team member who has worked with him for some time indicated that he had "matured in the past few years and has relaxed some." The bureaucratic orientation might be a hold over from his previous work style and his attention to tasks, coupled with his desire to succeed and make certain that his college fulfills its mission. From information gathered during his interview, he was extremely committed to this team and to the idea of team leadership.

The observation of the team meeting confirmed the evidence gathered during the interviews. The meeting was very open, relaxed, and generated a great deal of discussion from all team members. Most of the communication flowed laterally from team member to team member. No one dominated the discussion or was excluded. The team members spoke as frequently as the president. The atmosphere of the meeting was very convivial, and was punctuated often with laughter. Team members seemed pleased to see one another and appeared to genuinely like one another. There was no obvious discomfort in being observed by an outsider. The researcher sat off to one side where the team could be observed unobtrusively. After the meeting, the president asked for feedback about the meeting from the researcher and said, "I think that we forgot you were even there."

The most consistent theme that emerged from the Heartland research was some stress that the team was feeling due to very heavy workloads and a concomitant lack of time. The researcher's observation of the team at work within the team and outside of the team verified this theme. Many times during the interviews, team members were interrupted by a person coming to the office or urgent phone calls. It is understandable that the team expressed a concern about finding a "source for rejuvenation" or a means to prevent burnout. As one team member said, "As a public institution, every taxpayer is a person you should listen to." This strong tie to the community and its taxpayers placed additional stresses and expectations upon the president and upon his president's council. It was also one of the things that sets the community college apart in terms of governing other institutions of higher education.

CHAPTER FIVE

CROSS-SITE ANALYSIS

The cross-site analysis presents a comparison of the three presidential leadership teams in order to discover commonalities and differences, and build themes to conceptualize the data from all cases. The categories of analysis includes demographic data and the teams' milieux, the presidents' cognitive frame(s), the teams' functional domain(s), perceptions of team leadership and its effectiveness, the cognitive complexity of teams, the team observations, and an assessment of the teams as a reflection of the Bensimon and Neumann (1993) model.

Demographic Data and the Teams' Milieux

The three institutions included in this study were all medium-size comprehensive community colleges with a wide range of program offerings and community services. Two colleges were single-campus institutions and one was part of a four-campus community college district. River City Community College, an urban campus, had the most diverse student body. Thirty-seven percent of its students were African-American, Hispanic, Asian, and Native American. Great Plains Community College, a suburban campus, and Heartland Community College, a rural campus, had the least diverse student bodies--86 percent of the students on both campuses were Caucasian.

However, the percent of minority students at Great Plains had doubled over the past five years.

The three colleges resided in distinct settings; one was urban, one suburban, and the other was rural. The urban and suburban community colleges had fairly equivalent service area populations, while the rural college's service area was approximately 50 percent smaller. There was also a difference in terms of staffing. The River City and Heartland colleges employed approximately one staff member for every 10 students, while the Great Plains ratio was around one staff member for every 15 students. Part of this discrepancy was due to the fact that the Great Plains college was part of a multi-campus district. Approximately 100 employees located at the district headquarters served the entire district in capacities such as business office functions and human resources. Factoring in the additional 100 employees brought the ratio down to one employee for every 12 students. One of the district vice chancellors acknowledged that the district was "very thinly staffed." Although the Great Plains team might ostensibly carry a heavier workload and more responsibility than the other two teams, both at the college and the district level, they did not indicate that they were any more concerned about workload than the other team members. In contrast, some on the Heartland team voiced concern about heavy workloads and lack of time to accomplish tasks, even voicing concern about "burnout" and finding a source for "rejuvenation."

The presidents in this study were remarkably similar in personal characteristics. All were Caucasian males in their early to mid-50s, all have substantial experience in higher education, and all were promoted to the presidency from within their institutions. Two had been in the presidency for four or five years, while the other had an 18 year tenure. One president held the M.B.A. degree and the other two held the doctorate. All three presidents had been with their institutions for a substantial length of time; the president holding the M.B.A. had been with his institution for 25 years, and the other two, for 9 and 16 years.

Team members were also not very diverse in terms of age, gender, ethnicity, and experience in higher education. There were only four female team members out of the 12, and only two African-American team members, one of whom was also a female. The teams were fairly young in terms of tenure in their current positions, averaging around three years. The newest team member of the 12 had been in the position for six months, while the team member with the longest tenure on a team was eight years. Eight team members had been in their positions from one and a half to three years.

Since team building is a long and time consuming endeavor, a never ending endeavor according to Bensimon and Neumann (1993), these three teams could be considered to be in the process of coalescing. Every team included in this study had fairly new team members. As new team members are introduced and older ones leave the team, a process of integration unfolds to incorporate new members. The newest team member in this study spoke about the "history and tradition" of the institution getting in the way of needed change. As an outsider with no sense of institutional history, this team member felt that it had been difficult to come into the team and discuss the need for change. One team member acknowledged that turnover in the team could be desirable, as it kept the team from "stagnating."

Three of the four female members of these teams described feeling an extra burden of responsibility or greater scrutiny as team members. Likewise, the two African-American team members felt that it was their responsibility to bring a "different perspective" or a "minority viewpoint" into the team's thinking. One team member voiced a concern that a teammate, who happened to be an African-American, was not speaking up more at meetings or making more decisions. That perception had apparently not been discussed within the team, but was expressed to the researcher. Although the team member referenced did not indicate during the interview a feeling of being excluded or silenced, Bensimon and Neumann (1993) indicate that women and members of ethnic groups are often excluded from discussions or are silenced by reminders that they are not members of the dominant coalition. Team members in the dominant coalition are often unaware of, or may not be able to perceive, the subtle ways in which others are excluded.

The size of the three leadership teams varied to some extent. Two teams were very similar in size, the other dissimilar. These similarities and differences were reflective of each college's organizational structure. The River City Community College team was made up of three vice presidents, making it top heavy in terms of executive leadership compared to the other two colleges. The organizational chart of River City projected a steep hierarchy, with eight deans reporting to three vice presidents, and 24 directors reporting to the eight deans or the vice presidents. Conversely, Heartland and Great Plains community colleges did not have vice presidents, and therefore their organizational profiles were relatively flat. At these two colleges, the president's leadership team was composed of four or five deans, associate deans, and directors.

In the Bensimon and Neumann study (1993), the presidents were asked to select up to four individuals to interview, so it was not known how many individuals actually made up their teams. In this study, the presidents were asked to supply the names of all members of their leadership teams. It is difficult to determine the ideal size of a team, but a broader base of participation and inclusivity may contribute positively to the diversity and cognitive complexity of a team. In the smaller team in this study, for example, the five core cognitive roles and three supporting cognitive roles had to be shared by four people (including the president), whereas the largest team had six people to share the cognitive roles. It may be more difficult to adequately give voice to multiple roles on a small team than it is to play only one or two roles on a larger team.

None of the colleges in this study were facing any imminent crises, but all three were currently dealing with similar issues--funding and budgetary issues, governance issues, issues related to the faculty bargaining unit and negotiations, and combating shrinking enrollments. In general, all presidents and all team members felt very positively about how their teams had dealt with these issues, even though most of the issues were ongoing. Team members indicated that they had learned "it's safe to take a risk" in proposing creative solutions to team issues, and that "we need to do some thinking on our own before we come into the meetings." The importance of "not tak[ing] disagreement personally" and "tak[ing] some account of people's feelings, however petty that you think they might be" were also valuable lessons learned as a result of dealing with issues that have the potential to generate conflict or debate. Elaborating, one team member said, "you have to be concerned about that because you're dealing with [teammates'] lives." The team members in the study also discovered, through dealing with complex issues, that "change takes time," and that "even in a conservative environment change is possible and mandated."

Presidents' Cognitive Frame(s)

The three presidents in this study all differed in terms of cognitive frames. Two presidents espoused multi-frame perspectives--the president of River City espoused the frames collegial/political/symbolic and the president of Great Plains the frames collegial/political/bureaucratic. According to Bensimon (1989), espousing a multi-frame perspective implies that the president has the ability to shift frames in response to different circumstances. Multi-framed presidents usually have more than five years of experience in their positions. The multi-framed president of River City had been a president for a total of six years--four at River City and two at another community college, and the multi-framed president of Great Plains had been a president for 18 years.

The president of Heartland, the newest in terms of tenure as a president, espoused a paired-frame orientation of collegial/bureaucratic. Presidents in paired frames also tend to have more than five years in their positions, while half of all presidents with single frames have been in office one to three years (Bensimon, 1989). The president of Heartland was in the sixth year of his first presidency, and was promoted from a dean's position in the same institution. A paired-frame theory usually combines two frames in a complimentary way, hence it was unusual to find a paired frame of collegial/bureaucratic. The bureaucratic frame, as a single frame, is antithetical to team building, as its focus is on power, control, and communicating via established hierarchies. Conversely, presidents in the collegial frame seek participative, democratic decision making and emphasize meeting the needs of people (Bensimon, 1989). It would be reasonable to expect, therefore, that a president with the paired-frame combination of collegial/bureaucratic would experience some internal tension regarding espoused theories and leadership behaviors. The president of Heartland, for example, spoke often in collegial terms yet exhibited intrusive management behaviors. The Heartland president's bureaucratic frame might be a vestige from his early years as president, when he struggled to establish his role, according to some team members, in an institution where he had served at a lower level for 11 years. As he had grown more comfortable in the presidency and more confident of his team, he might have broadened in his leadership orientation to include a collegial frame. One team member indicated that he had grown as a president over the past three years. That growth could be reflected in the expansion of his cognitive frame of reference to incorporate the collegial frame, and perhaps over time further growth will incorporate other frames as well.

In a prior study on presidents, Bensimon (1989) found that the majority of community college presidents did not reflect a bureaucratic frame as expected; rather, the collegial and symbolic frames were used the most frequently. This expectation was based on the common view that community colleges are structurally and administratively bureaucratic. Bensimon (1989) postulated that the reason community college presidents clustered in the single-frame theory is because they view their organizations as closed systems with centralized decision-making, and view themselves, rather than the faculty, as having control over transactions with the external environment. The current study did not bear out that view. Of the three presidents studied, all three utilized more than one frame, and the frame used the most frequently was the collegial frame. This presents more evidence, as earlier proposed by Vaughan (1986), that community college leadership is evolving to a more participative and shared approach.

In this study, the presidents exhibited a wide range of leadership behaviors. At one end of the continuum was a collegial president who still tended to micro-manage his team on occasion, and at the other end of the continuum was a collegial president who felt that his team should be able to function without him. The third president did not micro-manage his team but also was not very available to them. Even though one president was accused of micro-managing, all three presidents were described very positively by the team members. The president of Great Plains was described the most positively. Descriptors such as "hard worker," "provides a clear vision," "good communicator," "very open," and "supportive and encouraging" were common for all presidents.

Team Functional Domains

Each of the three teams in this study performed useful functions in all three team functional domains. The theme that emerged when the presidents identified the most useful activities performed by their teams was the importance of all functional domains, as each president mentioned activities in all three domains. If conventional wisdom regarding the bureaucratic nature of community colleges were true, the researcher should have found the teams primarily performing activities in the utilitarian domain, where maintaining control over institutional functioning is emphasized (Bensimon and Neumann, 1993). However, activities in the cognitive domain were usually mentioned the most frequently, and included the importance of having different perspectives or different ideas and backgrounds. The utilitarian function was primarily viewed as decision-making, and the expressive function as communication.

Team members, on the other hand, identified useful functions in all three functional domains, but most frequently mentioned the expressive domain. Expressive functions included communication, mutual support, collaboration, cooperation, and celebration. Most team members indicated that the camaraderie and opportunity to share frustrations were extremely important team functions, and that the team served as a "safe haven" where team members could retreat from administrative hassles. Cognitive functions identified by team members included the importance of different perspectives, creativity, and synergy. Utilitarian functions were mentioned the least frequently, and included making decisions, coordination, serving as a representative of one's particular group, and dissemination of information.

No common theme emerged when the presidents were asked to identify the least useful functions performed by their leadership teams. One president did not indicate a least useful function, as everything his team did was "important and critical to the institution." Another president mentioned working with the outside community, and the third president indicated "day-to-day routines." He elaborated on this statement by saying that a team should not be concerned with the specific details of a job, but rather they should find the right people to do the jobs and not micro-manage things:

> The leadership team should be the policy and big idea people and not the floor supervisor you'd probably find in a factory. They shouldn't be going around being overseers of everything that is happening. They should be establishing the flow, establishing the vision, establishing the direction, and then saying okay, select the best people and make sure the job is done.

Team members indicated that the least useful functions of the team were maintaining responsibility and authority for things that should be passed on to others, and dealing with team members' personal problems or personal conflict.

Perceptions of Team Leadership and its Effectiveness

The presidents in this study have differing opinions as to the effectiveness of their leadership teams. One president is extremely satisfied with his team, giving the teamwork a rating of "ten" on a ten-point scale, while the other two presidents indicated that there was room for improvement. Comments such as, "I think we're a real team" characterized the response of the Heartland president, while the River City and Great Plains presidents indicated, "I think we could be much more effective" and "I don't know that we're totally a team." The presidents were generally positive in assessing their team's overall effectiveness, but the Great Plains president indicated that he felt his team should be able to run the college without him. He qualified his statement by explaining that since most of his team members were relatively new, they were still learning how to be a team.

The team members responded somewhat more favorably than the presidents in rating their teamwork. Comments such as, "this is the strongest team I have ever been on," and "I think we are a pretty good team" were common. Team members also acknowledged that they had room for improvement, but the theme that emerged was the amount of pride and satisfaction that team members felt about the overall effectiveness of their teams. Comments such as, "I think we do a super job," and "[we are] the best leadership team in the entire district" were common.

Across all teams in this study, common themes emerged regarding the forces that impact team effectiveness, both positively and negatively. The major themes will be explored in terms of the collective wisdom team . participants can share with others in building effective teams.

Time

The amount of time that it takes to *be* a team, and also the amount of time it takes to make decisions was a common theme across all teams. More than one person on each team expressed a concern about the length of time it takes to reach a decision or a consensus. Concern was expressed that sometimes the team can become "bogged down" or spend time on issues that "don't deserve all the time." The River City team was also very concerned about having adequate time for meetings, as the president often canceled them to attend to other business. A team member on the River City team expressed the belief that canceled meetings indicated that there was something more important than the team meeting, and in his opinion "there is [no]thing more important than that."

In addition to the amount of time teamwork takes, team members also felt pressed for time in terms of the duties and obligations of their operational roles. The participants on the Great Plains team had duties at the district level in addition to those at their campus. The Heartland-team was concerned about lack of time to perform their administrative duties. Some team members also expressed concern that they did not spend more time together both informally at work and socially away from work. Informal meetings were difficult to schedule due to the pressures of administrative duties, leaving little time for them. In all, time pressures were seen as serious impediments to effective teamwork.

Presidents also expressed concern regarding lack of time. All three presidents were actively engaged in their communities, and spend considerable amounts of time representing their colleges to external constituencies. The president of Great Plains was also involved in district governance, which was taking an increasing amount of his time away from his campus. The president of River City represented the community colleges at the state level, serving as a "lobbyist" on behalf of all community colleges. The president of Heartland was actively involved with serving the needs of business and industry in his community, resulting in extremely long working hours and time commitments.

Most of the time spent away from the leadership team, for these three presidents, was due to the necessity of dealing with political issues either at the local, district, or state levels.

Trust

When presidents and team members described the things that get in the way of effective teamwork, the most common theme was "lack of trust." One president said, "you've got to have complete trust...if you don't have trust it just destroys the chemistry." The issue of trust was mentioned by every team, and virtually every team member discussed the importance of trust at some time during their interview. Although the team members stressed the importance of trust, this emphasis did not emanate from concerns about their own teams, but was a reflection of their impressions of what impedes teamwork in general. Likewise, two other common themes were cited as impediments to teamwork that were not issues for the teams in this study; one was "hidden agendas" or "personal agendas," and the other was losing sight of the total organizational goals, vision, or "what the team is trying to accomplish." The overall impression given the researcher was that these individuals have dealt with the issues of trust and personal agendas in the past in other situations and settings, or on these teams in the past when they were composed of different team members.

Communication

The importance of communication within the team also emerged as a theme that positively influenced team effectiveness. Every team rated the quality of the communication within the team very highly, and one team even expressed a concern that they were too communicative because they sometimes "talked things to death." Communication was seen as an important purpose for team meetings across all cases, and the majority of the team members indicated that effective communication was an essential ingredient in an effective team.

Every team reported the use of electronic mail and voice mail as additional communication tools, as the time constraints of busy schedules sometimes precluded face-to-face meetings. As mentioned earlier, some team members expressed concern that there was not enough time for individual meetings or socializing among team members. This was a belief held by some regardless if they were members of the team that indicated that they never socialized outside of work, the team that socialized outside of work occasionally, or the team that had a regular schedule of informal get-togethers outside of work.

A member on the team that never socialized outside of work indicated that it was unusual, in his experience, not to socialize with his colleagues on an informal basis. Although these team members were highly interactive during team meetings, there was little personal conversation or informal banter. Conversely, the team members with the greatest amount of informal socialization also appeared to be more upbeat in the team meeting, exhibiting considerable laughter, lighthearted banter, and personal conversation.

Functional Domains and Team Effectiveness

The strategies that team members described to keep a leadership team functioning effectively over time were primarily from the expressive domain. The common theme that developed among the three teams was the importance of this domain, including encouraging and supporting teammates, mutual trust, an opportunity for fun, effective communication, listening, receiving a pat on the back or a thank you, expressing appreciation to others, celebrating accomplishments, continual renewal, and showing interest in teammates as people.

For team members, a fully functioning team meant that their emotive needs were being met. The most common theme in terms of personal gain from team membership was the feeling of being valued and respected by teammates. Team members reported that a sense of belonging, increased self-esteem, and a feeling of care and compassion were important emotive aspects of team membership. The importance of dealing with conflict appropriately was an issue for the Great Plains team, as they were not allowed to express strong feelings openly. Not dealing with conflict openly could negatively impact the expressive function of the team, as the desired feeling of "connectedness" as described by Bensimon and Neumann (1993, pg. 38) is inhibited when conflict is unresolved. In a mutually supportive environment, feelings are allowed to surface whether they are positive or negative in order to enhance mutual understanding and "clear the air."

Presidents also acknowledge the importance of the expressive domain, as they, too, indicated the need for emotional support and counsel. One president said, "We're here to support one another. I think that is what the teamwork is all about." Two of the three presidents mentioned expressive strategies as important in keeping a team functioning effectively over time. One president, acknowledging the emotive needs of the team, said:

> I think letting them know that they are accomplishing and are appreciated is important. Pointing out within the team things they have done particularly well, sharing those things with the rest of the group, so that they all hear about it.

Other strategies from the expressive domain that presidents used included admitting that they made mistakes, not placing themselves above the team but functioning as equals, and developing a feeling of worth by providing positive feedback.

Cognitive domain strategies to keep a leadership team functioning effectively over time were emphasized by one president. "Creat[ing] an environment where new ideas can spring forward" was seen as an effective strategy, along with "find[ing] ways to make [ideas] work." For team members, strategies included providing constructive feedback, open dialogue, listening, freedom to express opinions, respect for diversity of opinions, perspectives, and backgrounds, an opportunity to reflect on larger issues, and turnover in personnel to keep new perspectives emerging in team deliberations. The importance of dealing with conflict appropriately also impacted the effectiveness of the cognitive function. When a president is uncomfortable with conflict, such as the Great Plains president, team members have to either shield him from it or work behind the scenes for resolution. Team effectiveness is then inhibited as the creativity that arises from healthy debate is stifled in decision making.

Strategies from the utilitarian domain included meaningful decisions, regular and frequent meetings, commitment to the team concept, leadership by example, and continuous improvement.

The Cognitive Complexity of Teams

In concert with Bensimon and Neumann's findings (1993), the thinking roles on these community college teams were fluid, and shifted from one person to another. It was common for one person to play many roles or no role, and in some cases, for all team members to play a particular role. The thinking roles were not well known or understood as a concept by most team members, and when they were asked to define their role on the team, most responded in operational terms. In other words, participants defined their roles in terms of the titles they hold or the group they represent.

Despite being weak at times, there was sufficient evidence to posit the existence of all eight thinking roles on each of the three teams. In some cases more than one person was identified as playing a particular role. The role of the Definer, for example, was attributed to every person on every team. If a person was mentioned more often as playing a particular role, that person was identified by the researcher as the "primary" role player, with the others acting as "secondary" players.

Core Cognitive Roles

The core cognitive roles form the substance of the team's thinking, and interact to select, create, elaborate, and shape the issues to which the team attends. The core cognitive roles are the Definer, Analyst, Interpreter, Critic, and Synthesizer (Bensimon and Neumann, 1993).

The role of the Definer was played the president on all three teams. In addition, all three presidents had the expectation that their team members would assist in defining the team's long and short-term agenda. In every case, the team agenda was a joint construction between the president and the team. One team member summed up the reality for all of the presidents when he said, "I think [the president's] approach is to develop leaders out of all of us."

Although developing leaders is not part of the Definer role *per se*, providing leadership is an integral part of this role. According to Bensimon and Neumann (1993, pg. 60), Definers contribute to leadership by making sense of the college's "gigantic stream of activity," and enacting behaviors based on their interpretations of the activities that will affect the work of the team. In the complex, turbulent, and uncertain world of community colleges today, every team member needs to be able to define issues.

The primary Analysts of these teams were described as having the ability to "look at all the angles," "see the big picture," and "examine other perspectives." Two of the Analysts were deans of student services, and the other was a vice president of executive services with primary responsibility for human resources. Although the cognitive roles were not dependent on operational position, all three of the Analysts were responsible for representing major constituents of the colleges--the students and the staff.

The primary Interpreters of these teams were the presidents. Although interpreting duties were shared on all three teams, it was the president who projected how the community would perceive the issues and how the issues fit with historical precedent. Community college presidents are very involved with serving the community, and thus have unique insights into community needs and perceptions that other team members may not have. In addition, every president in this study was promoted from within his institution, and has considerable tenure at his college. Therefore, these presidents may have a greater sense of historical precedent than the team members, most of whom had relatively short tenure at their institutions. At the same time, the presidents felt it was important for other team members to share this role, as "they each have their own constituencies they can monitor."

In every case, the role of the Critic was played the most frequently by the female and minority team members, who were also the newest team members in every case. Being a new team member may make it easier to play the role of the Critic, as according to one participant there is no "history and tradition" getting in the way of her thinking. An African-American female team member saw it as her responsibility to "bring up the hard issues." She never specified that the hard issues were related to ethnicity, but as she represented the area of human resources, issues of gender or race could be to what she alluded. Likewise, an African-American male team member indicated that he brought up issues related to minorities that others were uncomfortable to raise, "because they do not know how." On two of the teams, every team member, including the presidents, played the role of Critic. On the smallest team, two team members and the president played the role.

The primary Synthesizer on these teams was their president. Most often, presidents were described as "synthesizing, sorting out, and considering ideas and approaches in order to come up with a coherent plan." As presidents were ultimately responsible to their governing boards for the actions and decisions of the team, and served in the primary leadership position, they might naturally gravitate to this role. Each president described good presidential leadership as providing the overall direction and vision for the college. Vision may result as a synthesis of the team's thinking. One team member referred to the president as the team's "conductor," which is the person who brings all voices into harmony. Team members also played this role, but one team member in particular stood out as a perfect characterization of the Synthesizer. He was described in this way: "[the team member] will...oftentimes reflect on what is being said and many times comes up with a summary statement that well expresses the issue that's at the heart of what we're talking about."

Supporting Cognitive Roles

The supporting cognitive roles do not contribute directly to the substance of thinking, but monitor how people outside of the team view the team's behaviors, provide the direction and pace for the team's work, and respond to the feelings of the team members. The supporting cognitive roles are the Disparity Monitor, Emotional Monitor, and Task Monitor (Bensimon and Neumann, 1993).

The role of the Disparity Monitor was to "pick up from the grapevine (things) that may be potential problems," said one team member describing the collective action of the team. Only the River City team showed strong evidence for a team member playing the role of the Disparity Monitor, although all teams provided some evidence that team members filled this role by virtue of providing the voice of the different groups that each person represented. The presidents expected their team members to be the "eyes and ears and sensors," but only one person across all teams was identified specifically as playing the role. It was said that the person, "...stays on campus for lunch and goes down and has lunch with faculty and staff, and he picks up a lot of things..." As River City had experienced a great deal of tension between the faculty and the administration due to a stalemate in the collective bargaining process, the role of the Disparity Monitor might be particularly important for this team at this time due to this conflict. The presidents of Great Plains and Heartland also actively played this role, but primarily in terms of the community perspective, which may explain why there was little evidence of team members in this role at these two colleges.

The role of the Task Monitor on all three teams was played by the president and one or more team members. The presidents' task orientation was described as "keeping us on track" or "getting us back on track." Presidents were also described as "conductors" or "checkers" of the team's work. On one team, two team members played this role. One was identified as the "task master," and the other described herself as the one who "gets the details done."

The Emotional Monitor was a very important role to the members of the leadership teams, particularly when the expressive function of the team is as highly valued as it was in these three cases. One of the functions of the Emotional Monitor is to be particularly sensitive to relationship issues, and to assist team members in catching and helping resolve personal conflicts as they arise. Although the role of the Emotional Monitor is not to bury conflict, the person in this role should be attuned to conflict so that when it surfaces they are ready to assist the team in dealing with it. Two of the presidents in this study played the role, one as the primary Emotional Monitor. This president was very uncomfortable with open conflict and very sensitive to the concerns of others. The other president was also described as very sensitive and concerned about people personally. Three team members who played this role had backgrounds in counseling, social work, or human resources. They described themselves as "mediators," "menders," and "humorists," and often deliberately played this role when things on the team got too serious or too tense. None of the Emotional Monitors in this study were very comfortable with conflict, and as a result concentrated on developing or mending relationships as opposed to seeing conflict as a natural outgrowth of working together.

Team Observations

The purpose of the team observation was to augment data and perceptions gathered during the interviews by direct observation of the teams in action. Only one observation was scheduled per team, and the duration of the observed meetings was between one to three hours. The researcher specifically looked for evidence of the presidents' cognitive frame(s), the teams' functional domain(s), and the cognitive roles. In addition, patterns of interaction were observed as well as team member behavior and the "climate" of the team meetings.

Perceptions formed of two of the teams during the interview process were supported by the team observation. Two teams were highly interactive, with the presidents and team members generating a great deal of discussion. Most of the communication flowed laterally from team member to team member, and no one dominated the discussion or was excluded. The atmosphere was relaxed and open, and there was a good deal of laughter both before and during the meeting. The team members appeared to genuinely like and respect one another, and were comfortable being observed by an outsider. In both cases, the researcher was acknowledged and welcomed to the team meeting, and in one case invited to sit at the table with the team during the meeting. During the team meetings, it was possible to discern some of the cognitive roles being enacted. The team functional domains were also readily identifiable, and some of the presidents' frames of reference were apparent.

The one team meeting that did not match the perception formed during the interviews presented a conundrum for the researcher. It was unknown whether the team meetings at this site always proceed in the manner observed, or if the researcher happened to catch the team on an "off day." This president was very involved in governance issues at the state level, and spent a great deal of time at the state capitol "lobbying" for the community colleges. Due to his external focus, there were many times that meetings were canceled or he was unavailable to meet due to other obligations; this was true for the first observation date and a second team meeting was subsequently scheduled for observation. As evidenced by the interviews, the team felt the president's absence acutely.

Although all team members were very gracious during the interviews, the observation of this team meeting presented a different feeling. The researcher was not acknowledged or welcomed at the beginning of the meeting by the team members, and when the meeting was over and the team members filed out, there was very little acknowledgment of the researcher's presence. The team meeting was conducted in the president's office with the president seated behind his desk and the team seated in front of the desk. This is not a seating arrangement that one would expect with a collegial president.

especially when a conference room was available next to this office. Additionally, the president seemed rushed and not very encouraging of discussion on any particular item. The team meeting lasted only an hour, compared to two to three hours for the other two teams that meet on a weekly basis. Fifteen agenda items were covered in that one hour, leaving little room for much discussion. In addition, the team members seemed a little tense, most likely due to the hurried atmosphere of the meeting. This team also did not appear as inclusive as the other two teams, as one team member seemed to be somewhat excluded from the discussion. The president gave this team member several directives, but did not solicit his input in the process. A teammate, however, asked for his opinion on an issue that this team member brought forward. In addition, there was discussion on several items related to this team member's area of responsibility, but the team member did not contribute ideas and was not called upon to do so. At the end of the meeting, the president went around the room to give each team member an opportunity to contribute agenda items, and this team member contributed one. Although the issue could have benefited from a cognitive examination by the team, only one teammate, as referenced earlier, asked for his opinion on the issue. Ultimately, the president gave the team member a directive to seek additional input from outside the team, rather than initiating a more thorough discussion of the issue.

Assessment of the Teams as a Reflection of the Model

In accordance with the Bensimon and Neumann (1993) criteria, all three teams were complex teams both functionally and cognitively. The three teams all performed at least one useful activity in each of the three functional domains, and all exhibited evidence of at least four of the five core cognitive roles. These teams were also cognitively rich teams, as they not only contained the minimum number of required roles, but also showed evidence of all eight thinking roles. One president, the most long-standing, played all eight thinking roles. In addition, each team had members who played more than one role, and in some cases a particular role was played by all team members.

Even though the River City observation presented a conflicting view of the team, an assessment based solely on the interviews would lead one to determine that the team is complex. In this case, the researcher has given greater weight to the interviews to compensate for any bias during the team observation.

Summary

It is unlikely that a "perfect team" exists in reality. This study has demonstrated that every team, even those that are functionally and cognitively complex, has areas of needed improvement. Across all cases, team members indicated that learning how to be a team is a process that requires time and attention. One team member indicated that it had taken "a couple of years" to get through the learning phase. In addition, the desire to *be* a team is also a critical component of team success. At Great Plains, the team where there was the greatest consensus about team effectiveness and where team behavior was exhibited to the greatest degree, every team member had gone through team training. This further illustrates that team behaviors can be learned.

This cross-site analysis of three community college presidential leadership teams presents evidence that the teams are functionally and cognitively complex. All teams included in this study performed useful activities in all three team functional domains, and all eight thinking roles were present on each of the three teams. For team members, activities in the expressive domain were viewed as the most important, and for presidents activities in the cognitive domain were the most important team activities. Issues that the teams were dealing with are all very similar--funding and budgetary issues, governance issues, faculty collective bargaining, and shrinking enrollments.

Common themes emerged that could impact team effectiveness either positively or negatively. These themes are: 1) the importance of time, as teamwork is time consuming and requires all participants, including the president, to spend adequate time to ensure the team becomes a team; 2) the importance of mutual trust as well as mutual respect, as teamwork is an inter-dependent process; 3) the importance of effective communication, as it is the method by which team thinking occurs; and 4) the importance of emotional support, as it is the "glue" that holds the team together during the difficult times as well as the good times.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Overview of the Study

This qualitative study of team leadership in community colleges focused on developing insights about effective means that presidents used to build and influence the functioning of their leadership teams. In-depth interviews of the presidents and 12 team members of three Midwestern community colleges were conducted to capture perceptions of the effectiveness of the teams on which they serve, and to provide a thick, rich description of life within each team. In an attempt to control for any effect that size might have on community college teams, three medium-size community colleges were chosen for this study. The goal was to develop themes and discover lessons learned from the gathered data that could assist other community college leaders in creating functionally and cognitively complex teams.

The study was based on the research of Bensimon and Neumann (1993), who studied fifteen institutions of higher education and found that there were three basic functions of teams: 1) the utilitarian function, to help presidents achieve a sense of rationality and maintain control over institutional functioning; 2) the expressive function, to reinforce a sense of connectedness among team members; and 3) the cognitive function, to enlarge the intelligence of individual team members and to enable the team to act as a creative system. Bensimon and Neumann (1993) discovered that a president who could conceive all of the three team functions, rather than just one or even two, was much more likely to mold a "real" team. Presidents with "real" teams saw their teams as "performing at least one useful activity in each of the three functional domains" (pg. 45). Conversely, presidents with "illusory" teams used their groups only in one or two of the three functional domains.

The other component of complex "real" teams was cognitive complexity. Cognitively complex teams "perceive, discover, think, create, talk, speculate, and argue together" (Bensimon and Neumann, 1993, pg. 59) through eight "thinking roles" commonly found on a president's team. Bensimon and Neumann (1993) discovered that cognitively complex teams possessed at least four of the five core thinking roles (Definer, Analyst, Interpreter, Critic, Synthesizer), while cognitively simple teams usually lacked two or more of the five core thinking roles.

The influence of the president's cognitive frame(s) of reference on team leadership was also explored. Cognitive frames are conceptual maps for understanding an organization and interpreting the effectiveness of others' behavior. Frames focus the attention of individuals and can also serve as cognitive blinders, leaving what is "out of frame" unseen and unattended. Presidents may use only a single frame, or any of the frames in combination.

There are four frames that presidents may use to observe and interpret the community college: 1) the bureaucratic frame, which focuses on structure and organization, and emphasizes setting priorities, making orderly decisions, and communicating through established lines of authority; 2) the collegial frame, which focuses on the achievement of goals through collective action, and emphasizes building consensus, problem solving through teams, loyalty and commitment to the institution, and leading by example; 3) the political frame, which focuses on monitoring internal and external environments, the use of influence to mobilize needed resources, and emphasizes establishing relationships with constituencies, developing coalitions, and constructing compromises; and 4) the symbolic frame, which focuses on the management of meaning via interpreting the institution's history, maintaining its culture, and reinforcing its values by emphasizing language, myths, stories, and rituals to foster shared meaning and beliefs (Birnbaum, 1992, pg. 63-64).

The research was designed to compare and contrast the characteristics and composition of three presidential leadership teams in community colleges of similar size, assess team member perception of the effectiveness of team activities, evaluate the presidents' cognitive frame(s) of reference and the teams' functional domain(s), explore the extent to which the presidents' cognitive frame(s) influenced the teams' functional domain(s), assess the degree to which the teams were cognitively complex, and determine whether or not the teams were complex "real" teams or simple "illusory" teams.

The research questions were:

1) What are the characteristics and composition of presidential teams in community colleges?
2) How does the community college president's cognitive frame(s) of reference influence the team's functional domain(s)?
3) Are there any differences in the way members of the president's team perceive their participation in team leadership activities and the effectiveness of those activities?
4) How cognitively complex are community college leadership teams?
5) Are presidential teams in community colleges real or illusory?

Summary of the Research Findings

The major results of this study will be summarized to answer the research questions in the following categories: team composition, cognitive frames of reference, functional domains, team leadership effectiveness, and team cognitive and functional complexity.

Composition of Community College Teams

The presidents of the three community colleges in this study were very similar in terms of personal characteristics. They were all Caucasian males in their mid-50s, two of the three held a doctoral degree, and all had substantial experience in community college leadership. There was an average of four team members on the presidential leadership teams in this study, predominantly Caucasian males in their late 40s, who held the rank of dean or vice president and represented the operational areas of instruction, student services, administrative services, and continuing education. In terms of tenure, the teams in this study were fairly young. The average length of service for team members was two and one half years. Female and/or minority team members represented the newest members of the teams.

Community College Presidents' Cognitive Frames of Reference

Although Bensimon (1989) found that community college presidents' leadership theories tended to cluster in a single frame, the three community college presidents in this study used multiple cognitive frames of reference. Two presidents used three cognitive frames, and the other used a paired-frame orientation. The collegial frame was incorporated in all three presidents' leadership orientations, the political frame in two, the bureaucratic frame in two, and the symbolic frame in one.

In conjunction with Bensimon's (1989) findings, longevity in the position of president positively influenced the community college president's cognitive frame toward greater cognitive complexity. The two multi-framed presidents in this study also had the longest tenure in presidential positions, while the paired-frame president was in the sixth year of his first presidency. In Bensimon's (1989) study, new presidents with one to three years of tenure in office tended to use a single frame leadership theory, and those with five or more years of tenure tended to be multi-framed. This study also supports the view of Bensimon (1989) that presidents who use multiple frames may demonstrate a higher level of cognitive differentiation and integration. The two multi-framed presidents in this study also enacted multiple cognitive roles that contributed to the teams' cognitive functioning. One president played all eight cognitive roles, while the other played five cognitive roles in both the "core" and "supporting" role areas.

In this study, the president's cognitive frame of reference influenced the team's effectiveness. Presidents primarily functioning in the political frame can be too externally focused, and as a result not spend enough time with the team to fully develop the team's cognitive function and role. Presidents primarily functioning in the collegial frame can be so concerned with consensus that natural conflict is not allowed to surface, thereby stifling some of the team's creativity and communication. Presidents primarily functioning in the bureaucratic frame may make too many decisions themselves, thus cutting off the cognitive power and diversity of the team.

The president's cognitive frame of reference also influenced the team's functional domains. All the community college presidents in this study were multi-framed and all utilized their teams in all three functional domains. If a president were operating from a single frame, s/he might only utilize the team in one or two functional domains.

Community College Team Functional Domains

There was a difference in how presidents and team members viewed the importance of activities in the functional domains. Presidents placed the greatest value on activities performed in the cognitive functional domain, such as surfacing creativity and providing different perspectives, while team members placed the greatest value on activities performed in the expressive functional domain, including communication and providing mutual support.

Community College Team Leadership Effectiveness

Team members on these three community college presidential leadership teams rated their teamwork and the overall effectiveness of their teams slightly higher than teams were rated by the presidents. Although the presidents rated their teams highly, they all expressed the belief that their leadership teams could become more effective.

Three themes emerged that could influence the effectiveness of the president's leadership team either positively or negatively. These themes were the importance of trust and mutual respect, communication, and time for meetings. These themes will be discussed in-depth in the conclusions.

The Bensimon and Neumann model (1993) of presidential team leadership is an appropriate model by which to determine the effectiveness of activities within community college leadership teams. However, several key indicators of effectiveness outside of the team were not explored, such as the quality of the decisions made by the team in terms of *institutional* effectiveness, the degree to which the team positively influenced the leadership behaviors of others throughout the college, and the perceptions of effectiveness that faculty, staff, and trustees had of the leadership team.

Community College Team Complexity

All teams included in this study were functionally complex, as they performed useful activities in each of the three functional domains. Likewise, the three community college presidential leadership teams in this study were cognitively complex, and exhibited all five of the core cognitive roles as well as all three of the supporting cognitive roles.

Team members and presidents tended to play multiple cognitive roles, and in some cases all team members played a particular role. The roles enacted the most frequently by the presidents were Definer, Interpreter, Synthesizer, and Task Monitor. Team members from the operational areas of student services and human resources tended to play the role of Analyst, and the role of the Critic was most often played by the female and/or minority team members.

All but one of the female team members indicated that they felt an extra burden of responsibility, or greater scrutiny as representatives of their gender, in enacting cognitive roles. Likewise, the two African-American team members in this study indicated that they felt it was their responsibility to bring a "different perspective" or a "minority viewpoint" into the team's thinking. Bensimon and Neumann (1993) reported that female and minority team members often felt out of sync with the rest of the team, but did not make their feelings known. In the Great Plains case study, an African-American team member was criticized by a teammate for not speaking up more or making more decisions. This minority team member might have been experiencing a form of inadvertent silencing described by Bensimon and Neumann (1993). Silencing can occur when team members, such as women and minorities, withhold dissent because their views are not held by the dominant coalition. The silent team members feel alienated from the team, while their teammates are unaware of the subtle ways in which they have excluded or silenced them.

Members of these three community college leadership teams tended to define their roles in operational terms (the position they hold or the groups they represent) rather than in terms of a thinking process. In the Bensimon and Neumann (1993) model, the tendency of team members to view their roles in operational terms can be an impediment to the team's cognitive functioning, although that was not the case in this study.

All three community college teams in this study were classified as cognitively and functionally complex, the key indicators of "real" teams, according to the Bensimon and Neumann (1993) model. Determining the status of a team as complex and "real" versus simple and "illusory" was not as simple as determining whether or not the teams showed evidence of functional and cognitive complexity. In the Bensimon and Neumann study (1993), the researchers did not observe the teams in action. In this study, teams were observed once to determine whether or not impressions gained during interviews of the presidents and team members matched the perceptions of the team's functioning in their natural setting. In one case, the way team members and the president described the team did not match what the researcher observed.

Although all three teams in this study were complex, "real" teams, each lacked an element of effectiveness as identified by Bensimon and Neumann (1993). One team did not provide adequate time for meetings, one team did not deal with conflict within the team, and one president did not completely empower the team to carry out their leadership duties and responsibilities. Other elements must also be assessed to adequately determine team effectiveness, such as the amount of time the participants spend together in team activities, the quality of the decisions that the team makes, and the degree to which the team models team behavior and thus influences the formation of more participatory structures throughout the campus.

In these three cases, all presidents exhibited behaviors that were also detriments to team functioning: one did not deal with conflict within the team, one did not spend enough time with his team to be a full member of the team, and the other exhibited bureaucratic behaviors. The leadership orientation of the president, therefore, is a critical factor in determining team success.

Conclusions

Although this study demonstrated that the researcher found real presidential teams in three Midwestern community colleges, there were elements in every case that did not fit the model.

In the Bensimon and Neumann (1993, pg. 49-51) study, institutional size and context influenced real teamwork. Presidents in small institutions were more apt to have real teams, while those in large institutions were unlikely to have real teams. The authors found that tightly coupled smaller institutions were more conducive settings for tightly coupled real teams. This setting is most frequently found in small, private, four-year colleges. The relative absence of real teams in large, public universities is seen by the authors as a result of the political and anarchic nature of these institutions. Leadership in the large universities, according to Bensimon and Neumann (1993), is more likely to rely on "power tactics, negotiation, coalitional dynamics, and persistence more than on collaboration" (pg. 50). University presidents, according to the authors, are more externally focused due to the pressures of fundraising and network building.

Community colleges, however, are also political institutions, and community college presidents need to be externally focused in order to meet the needs of the community. These presidents must deal with locally elected boards of trustees or state governing boards, leaders of business, industry, and government, and the myriad external constituencies who demand services from a comprehensive community college. In a community college setting, "every taxpayer is a person you should listen to" (Heartland case study), as in most cases the majority of the community college's funding comes from local sources. A community college president who is unable to use a political cognitive frame would be at a disadvantage in terms of effectiveness in this environment.

The difference in the ways in which community college presidents in medium-size colleges demonstrate leadership internally and externally may provide insight into the reasons why the Bensimon and Neumann (1993) model of team leadership works in a community college setting. While community college presidents may function externally like the presidents of large, complex universities as described by Bensimon and Neumann (1993), internally they are increasingly expected to lead in a collegial fashion like the presidents of small, private, four year colleges (Carter and Alfred, 1996). However, this dichotomy can cause community college presidents to become divided in terms of loyalty and goals; on one hand the president must satisfy external constituencies and on the other, must attend to the needs of internal constituencies and the president's leadership team. As illustrated in this study, attending to external needs consumes a great deal of the presidents' time and can diminish the amount of time spent with the leadership team, thus negatively influencing effectiveness.

If the conclusions drawn by Bensimon and Neumann (1993) were taken to their logical conclusion in relation to community college team leadership, one would expect to find the absence of "real" teams due to the political nature of the institutions. Instead, this study has shown that at the three selected community colleges, presidential teams are complex, both functionally and cognitively, and therefore "real" in the Bensimon and Neumann (1993) model. This could be due to the size of the institutions studied, as a medium-size community college of 4,000-6,000 students may be more equivalent in size to a small, four year college. Bensimon and Neumann (1993) found that size makes a difference in whether or not teams are found; small, four-year colleges were the institutions in which the authors found the most teams. Another possible explanation is the leadership orientation of the three presidents in this study. All three used the collegial frame, and for two presidents the collegial frame appeared to be the primary frame they used. It is also noteworthy that all three presidents in this study were promoted from within their institutions. It is not clear what impact promotion from within had on the presidents' cognitive frames of reference. On one hand, promotion from within could influence a more collegial leadership orientation, as it may be difficult to view former peers as subordinates. Or, as Vaughan described (1989, pg. 42), promotion from within could considerably narrow the leadership orientation, as the president may be preoccupied with the previous area of responsibility.

Although community colleges are political institutions like the large, complex universities, there is another difference that may explain why teams would more likely appear in community colleges than in universities. Universities, according to Bensimon and Neumann (1993, pg. 50), may be inhospitable to team leadership due to their "anarchic qualities" and to their tendency to act as "adhocracies." Since community colleges are structurally smaller and more tightly coupled than large universities, and do not operate as organized anarchies, the culture and climate may be more conducive to teams. Community colleges are very egalitarian in nature (Cohen and Brawer, 1996), in that they attempt to serve the learning needs all segments of the community, whether they be youth, traditional students, non-traditional students, persons with disabilities, or older adults. Likewise, it is common to find a wide range of participation on college standing committees, including faculty, students, administrators, members of the staff, and occasionally representatives of the governing board.

The greatest pitfalls in building community college executive leadership teams may reside in the pressure exerted on the president from outside the institution. Community college presidents are increasingly pulled "into the vortex of what four-year presidents have for years referred to as the external presidency" (Vaughan, 1994, pg. 1). Satisfying internal needs may be left to the leadership team, but in doing so the team is not able to fully take advantage of the president's cognitive contributions. The external focus coupled with the internal demands of leading a community college may explain why each of the three teams in this study, although technically "real" in the Bensimon and Neumann (1993) model, exhibit factors that impinge on team effectiveness. External pressures pull time and attention away from team activities, and coupled with the president's external orientation, a team could be left to function on its own. In a highly political climate, the president needs the team to move the institution forward, but has less available time to attend to the team.

Even though the three teams in this study met the criteria for functional and cognitive complexity, in every case there were indicators of simple teamwork. In the River City case study, an externally-oriented president in the political frame spent a great deal of time away from his team attending to political activities. As a result, the three team members felt that they were more of a team without the president than with him, and sometimes worked together on important issues as a team without the president. In the Great Plains case, a president functioning in the collegial frame might be so concerned with consensus that natural conflict was not allowed to surface, causing team members to either stifle conflict and thus stifle creative decision making, or deal with conflict outside of the team thus diminishing the expressive function of teamwork. In the Heartland case, a president in the bureaucratic frame, even though it may not be his primary lens, might reserve decision making to himself and thus micro-manage the team. As a result, team members felt frustration that they were not given the authority and responsibility to carry out their job functions absent of close supervision.

This study points out the critical role that presidents play in building and maintaining a complex team. In the three community colleges in this study, the president primarily provides the vision and defines the team's agenda, interprets how the community will perceive the issues, builds and articulates a summative picture of the team's reality, and facilitates the team's work processes. It has been demonstrated in these three case studies that the president's cognitive frame influences the team's functioning. A president in the collegial frame may encourage and support teamwork and consensual decision making, but may also avoid conflict and thereby stifle the cognitive creativity that arises from disagreement and debate. Suppressing conflict does not enhance collegiality or the care and compassion of team members. According to Bensimon and Neumann (1993, pg. 109), connected team members should feel the emotions of their teammates, whether it is "anger, frustration, satisfaction, or commitment." A president in the bureaucratic frame may help the team organize and set priorities, but also hold power and decision making so closely that team members are unable to function very effectively as a team. A president in the political frame may be adept in team building by using influence and skills in building relationships, but may be externally focused to the point that the team essentially functions alone. A president in the symbolic frame may bring skills in creating the team's culture, rituals, and language, but may also ignore the day-to-day processes of teamwork.

This study also demonstrates that there is difference in the way team members and presidents view the most important functions of the leadership team. For presidents, the most important functions were in the cognitive domain, but for team members the most important functions were in the expressive domain. For team members, a fully functioning team means that their emotive needs are being met--that there is trust, mutual respect, mutual support, and caring. A group that *calls* itself a team may keep a college running effectively, but *being* a team to the members in this study implies a need to feel and believe that the team collective is important. In one of these cases, the team members expressed a desire for more social interaction. In concert, Bensimon and Neumann's (1993) research suggested that effective teams strike a balance between task accomplishment and solidarity. According to the authors, the time team members spend together socially may be as important to the team's functioning as the time spent together getting things done. Bolman and Deal (1992) also found that humor and play reduce tension and encourage creativity.

Some presidents may not attend as much to the team's expressive needs as the team members would like. Some presidents, such as Vincent Craft in the Great Plains case, are particularly adept at paying attention to expressive needs even though there is little social interaction away from work. Attending to the team collective is important to both presidents and team members. Regular meetings, a high level of communication, demonstrating care and connection, and creating a climate of trust and mutual respect are important messages that what the team is doing is valued and important to the college.

Implications for Practice

The findings of this study suggest several implications for practice.

1. The formation of a presidential leadership team is a conscious decision on the part of the president and potential team members. Time, effort,

and resources must be invested by all players to fully realize the potential of a leadership team.

2. Becoming an effective team is enhanced by training in the philosophy and practices of team leadership. Team members need a common vocabulary and definition of team leadership terms, including the functional domains, cognitive roles, and cognitive frames in order to fully understand the dynamics of cognitive team leadership.

3. When the team acquires new team members and as team dynamics change, retraining in team techniques will be needed for all team members to integrate the new member. When a new member joins the team, it changes the team's dynamics and makes it necessary to through the team formation stage once again.

4. The processes of team leadership take time. Presidents and team members should be prepared to invest a considerable amount of time in team training and development, and in doing the cognitive work that is required for an effectively functioning leadership team.

5. Teams need developing, nurturing, and support. As a result, presidents need to be willing to develop skills for attending to the team members' emotive needs. A mechanism to regularly provide presidents and team members feedback on team dynamics, and to check perceptions regarding team functioning, should be established.

6. Presidents and team members need training in how to deal with conflict, as conflict is inevitable, healthy, contributes to the cognitive complexity of the team, and facilitates change. Conflict that is appropriately managed does not negatively impact either the expressive or cognitive functions of the team.

7. A concentrated effort to build trust and mutual respect is key to the development of an effective leadership team. Mutual trust may be the most important variable in team leadership effectiveness. Without trust, there can be no team.

8. In order to become a cognitive team, team members must understand the difference between operational role or position and cognitive roles, and be encouraged to participate in enacting one or more cognitive roles. In addition, as cognitive diversity contributes positively to team effectiveness, a concerted effort should be made to provide an open, and supportive environment where cognitive diversity can be safely explored.

9. It is important for the team to value and support the role of the Critic. In this study, the Critic was played by the female and/or minority team members. It may be difficult for team members who are not part of the dominant culture to speak up on issues, especially when their opinions differ from those in the majority. When the role of the Critic is enacted by a woman or a member of a minority group, dominant members may discount their views

and thus negatively impact the cognitive diversity of the team. Critics of any gender or ethnicity are essential to the team, as they raise issues and recognize differences that others may prefer not to acknowledge.

10. As a fully functioning team is functionally complex, team members and presidents need to be certain that the team performs useful and meaningful activities in the utilitarian, expressive, and cognitive functional domains.

Implications for Research

There are several implications for further research, especially on team leadership in a community college setting. These avenues of exploration are described below.

1. The role of trust in developing effective leadership teams in community college settings should be explored. What is trust, and how do you measure and build it? What is the role of the president in building trust among the members of an executive leadership team? What is the role of the team members?

2. An exploration of the impact of gender and ethnicity on team leadership in community colleges is needed. What differences, if any, would be found if this study were applied to community college presidential leadership teams in which the president is either female or a member of a minority group? Do gender or ethnicity influence leadership behaviors, follower behaviors, or cognitive diversity in a team setting?

3. There are several unanswered questions regarding the influences on the team's effectiveness and cognitive diversity. What are the differences in terms of team effectiveness and cognitive diversity between leadership teams with "old" presidents versus "new" presidents? Between presidents hired from within the institution and presidents who are externally hired? Between teams with "old" versus "new" team members? Does the size of the leadership team make a difference?

4. How can presidents positively influence the emotive aspects of teamwork for the leadership team? What techniques can further group cohesiveness? How do effective presidents deal with conflict in a team setting?

5. The effect that community college size may have on "real" versus "illusory" teamwork should be explored. Is it more likely that "real" teams will be found in small community colleges and "illusory" teamwork in large community colleges?

6. Are there effective training programs in team leadership that presidents and team members can use to assist in the development of community college leadership teams?

7. What are the characteristics and competencies that make up an effective team leader beyond multi-frame leadership theories? Are there specific competencies that community college team leaders need?

8. Are the utilitarian, expressive, and cognitive domains inclusive of community colleges as well as universities? Are there other domains, such as the public domain, in which community colleges operate?

Summary

In summary, this qualitative study of team leadership in community colleges has examined the relationship between the presidents' cognitive frame of reference and its influence on team effectiveness. The study has revealed that the effectiveness of the process of team leadership, in terms of the activities undertaken and decisions made, is dependent upon team member mutuality, a clearly defined vision and common goals, trust and mutual respect among all team members, a jointly defined agenda, inclusivity, shared leadership, diversity of perspectives, attending to and valuing all input, and meeting the needs of team members for respect, development, self actualization, and success.

REFERENCES

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. (1988). Building communities: A vision for a new century. A Report of the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges. Washington, D.C.

Acebo, S. C. (1994). A paradigm shift to team leadership in the community college. In G.A. Baker (Ed.), A handbook on the community college in America (pp. 580-588). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Baker, G. A. III and Associates. (1992). Cultural leadership: Inside America's community colleges. Washington, DC: Community College Press.

Baker, G. A. III and Associates. (1995). Team building for quality: Transitions in the American community college. Washington, DC: Community College Press.

Bassin, M. (1988). Teamwork at General Foods: New and improved. Personnel Journal, 67(5), 62-70.

Below, P. J., Morrissey, G. L., and Acomb, B. L. (1990). What is strategic planning? In P. J. Below, G. L. Morrissey, and B. L. Acomb, The executive guide to strategic planning (pp. 1-15). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bennis, W. and Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders: Strategies for taking charge. New York: Harper & Row.

Bensimon, E. M. (1989). The meaning of good presidential leadership: A frame analysis. Review of Higher Education, 12(2), 107-123.

Bensimon, E. M. and Neumann, A. (1993). Redesigning collegiate leadership: Teams and teamwork in higher education. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bergquist, W. H. (1993). The collegial culture. In W. H. Bergquist, The four cultures of the academy (pp. 17-31). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bess, J. L. (1988). Collegiality and bureaucracy in the modern university: The influence of information and power on decision-making structures. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bing, R. and Dye, L. (1992). The danger of hierarchical decision-making. Academe, Jul.-Aug., 16-18.

Birnbaum, R. (1988). How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Birnbaum, R. (1992). How academic leadership works: Understanding success and failure in the college presidency. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Boggs, G. R. (1995). "The president and the executive leadership team: Solving strategic problems." In G. A. Baker III and Associates, Team building for quality: Transitions in the American Community College (pp. 63-77). Washington, D.C.: The Community College Press.

Bolman, L. G. and Deal, T. E. (1984). Modern approaches to understanding and managing organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bolman, L. G. and Deal, T. E. (1991). Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bolman, L. G. and Deal, T. E. (1992). What makes a team work? Organizational Dynamics, 21(2), 34-44.

Blyn, M. R. and Zoerner, C. E. (1982). The academic string pushers: The origins of the upcoming crisis in the management of academia. Change, 14(2), 21-15.

Cameron, K. S. (1991). Organizational adaptation and higher education. In M. Peterson (Ed.), ASHE reader in organization and governance in higher education (pp. 284-299). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. (1973). Governance of higher education: Six priority problems. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Carter, P. and Alfred, R. (1996). Breaking out of the box: New colleges for a new century. 1996 Critical Issues Paper, Consortium for Community College Development.

Cohen, A. M. and Brawer, F. B. (1996). The American community college (3rd Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Cohen, A. M., Brawer, F. B. and Associates. (1994). Managing community colleges: A handbook for effective practice. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Dumaine, B. (1994). The trouble with teams. Fortune, 130(5), 86-92.

Duncan, A. H. and Harlacher, E. L. (1991). The twenty-first century executive leader. Community College Review, 18(4), 39-47.

Feldman, K. A. And Newcomb, T. N. (1969). The impact of college on students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Fisher, J. L. (1984). The power of the presidency. New York: ACE/Macmillan.

Fisher, K. (1993). Leading self-directed work teams: A guide to developing new team leadership skills. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Fryer, T. W. (1989). Governance in the high-achieving community college. In T. O'Banion, Innovation in the community college (pp. 215-243). New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Gabarro, J. J. (1987). The dynamics of taking charge. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Gordon, R. A. (1995). Can community colleges do the job? Leadership Abstracts, 8(8), 1-2.

Guskin, A. E. and Bassis, M. A. (1985). Leadership styles and institutional renewal. Leadership and institutional renewal. New Directions for Higher Education, no. 49 (pp. 13-22). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Guzzo, R. A. and Dickson, M. W. (1996). Teams in organizations: Recent research on performance and effectiveness. Annual Review of Psychology, 47, 307-338.

Hackman, J. R. (Ed.). (1990). Groups that work (and those that don't). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Hahn R. (1995). Getting serious about presidential leadership. Change, 27(5), 12-19.

Harris, P. R. (1989). High performance leadership: Strategies for maximum career productivity. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.

Helgesen, S. (1995). The web of inclusion: A new architecture for building great organizations. New York: Doubleday.

Hodges, N. L. and Milliron, M. D. (1997). On community college renewal. Leadership Abstracts, 10(1), 1-2.

Hoerr, J. (1989, July 10). The payoff from teamwork. Business Week, 56-62.

Hogan, R., Curphy, G. J. and Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and personality. American Psychologist, 49(6), 493-504.

Kanter, R. M. (1983). Dilemmas of managing participation. Organizational Dynamics, 10(2), 5-27.

Katzenbach, J. R. and Smith, D. K. (1993). The wisdom of teams: Creating the high-performance organization. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, Inc.

Kotler, P. and Murphy, P. (1991). Strategic planning for higher education. In M. Peterson (Ed.), ASHE reader in organization and governance in higher education (pp. 239-251). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.

Kouzes, J. M. and Posner, B. Z. (1995). The leadership challenge: How to keep getting extraordinary things done in organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Larson, C. E. and LaFasto, F. M. (1989). Teamwork: What must go right, what can go wrong. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Manz, C. C. and Sims, H. P. (1989). SuperLeadership: Leading others to lead themselves. New York: Prentice-Hall.

McCann, D. J. and Margerison, C. (1989). Managing high performance teams. Training and Development Journal, 43(11), 53-60.

McClure, B. and Stanco, T. (1996). The peloton: Riding the winds of change. Leadership Abstracts, 9(12), 1-2.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). Case study research in education: A qualitative approach. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Morgan, G. (1986). Images of organization. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Neumann, A. (1991). The thinking team: Toward a cognitive model of administrative teamwork in higher education. Journal of Higher Education, 62(5), 485-513.

Palmer, J. C. (1994). Educational planning and assessment. In A. M. Cohen and F. B. Brawer and Associates, Managing community colleges: A handbook for effective practice (pp. 457-474). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Pascarella, E. T. and Terenzini, P. T. (1991). How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Phelan, D. J. (1997). The niche community college: Is it our future? Community College Journal, 67(4), 30-33.

Ray, D. And Bronstein, H. (1995). Teaming up: Making the transition to a self-directed, team-based organization. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Reich, R. B. (1987). Entrepreneurship reconsidered: The team as hero. Harvard Business Review, May-June, 77-83.

Rice, R. and Austin, A. (1991). High faculty morale: What exemplary colleges do right. In M. Peterson (Ed.), ASHE reader in organization and governance in higher education (pp. 208-216). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.

Richardson, R. C., Jr. (1975). Reforming college governance. New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 10. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Riechmann, D. (1991). Team leader effectiveness in high-involvement, high-performance teams in higher education (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1991). Dissertation Abstracts International, 52/10, 3541.

Sarantos, S. T. (1994). Managing change by creating a synergistic environment. Leadership Abstracts, 7(11) 1-2.

Senge, P. M. (1990). The fifth discipline. New York: Doubleday.

Spitzberg, I. J. (1982). Notes from Wingspread. Academe, Jan.-Feb., 33.

Tierney, W. G. (1989). Advancing democracy. A critical interpretation of leadership. Peabody Journal of Education, 66, 157-175.

Tjosvold, D. and Tjosvold, M. M. (1991). Leading the team organization: How to create an enduring competitive advantage. New York: Lexington Books.

Twombly, S. and Amey, M. (1994). "Leadership skills for participative governance." In G. A. Baker III (Ed.), A handbook on the community college in America (pp. 268-283). Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.

Yukl, G. (1994). Leadership in organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Vaughan, G. B. (1986). The community college presidency. New York: ACE/Macmillan.

Vaughan, G. B. (1989). Leadership in transition: The community college presidency. New York: ACE/Macmillan.

Vaughan, G. B. and Associates (1992). Dilemmas of leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Vaughan, G. B. (1994). Institutionalization: The community college president's greatest challenge. Leadership Abstracts, 7(8), 1-2.

Vineyard, E. E. (1993). The pragmatic presidency: Effective leadership in the two-year college. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Weber, M. D. and Karman, T. A. (1989). Graphite into diamonds: Using teams to strengthen intercollegial interaction. Innovative Higher Education, 14(1), 49-56.

Wellins, R. S., Byham, W. C. and Dixon, G. R. (1994). Inside teams: How 20 world-class organizations are winning through teamwork. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

APPENDIX A

CONSENT FORMS

APPENDIX A

CONSENT FORM - PRESIDENTS

Linda Knudson
8511 W. 98th Street
Overland Park, KS 66121
(913) 469-2510

January 6, 1997

Dear (Name):

The Department of Educational Policy and Leadership at the University of Kansas supports the practice of protection for human subjects participating in research. The following information is provided for you to decide whether you wish to participate in the present study. You should be aware that even if you agree to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without penalty.

You are being asked to participate in a study conducted by Linda Knudson, a doctoral candidate at the University of Kansas. The study will focus on the president's leadership team in community colleges. I am interested in studying the effects of the president's leadership orientation and its relationship to how the leadership team functions. As part of this study, I would like to schedule an in-depth interview with you of approximately one and a half hours in length. With your permission, the interviews will be audio taped. You have the right to have the tape recorder turned off at any time you choose. You will be asked to discuss a variety of topics related to leadership, and the effectiveness of your leadership team. I am also requesting permission to interview the members of your leadership team, as you so designate. It is not likely that participants will experience any risk or discomfort from the interviews. The information you provide will be analyzed in conjunction with the interviews of your team members, and the presidents and team members of two other community colleges, to identify themes and issues related to team leadership. I would also like to observe a meeting of your leadership team to gain additional perspective about how this team functions. Again, participation in the interview process and the team observation is voluntary.

All information gathered from this study will be kept confidential. Neither individuals nor their colleges will be identified by name in any materials emanating from this study. The contribution of this research to the understanding of presidential leadership teams in community colleges may be significant, as no similar study has of yet been conducted. In exchange for your assistance, I would be more than happy to provide you with a completed report.

If you would like additional information concerning this study before or after it is complete, please feel free to contact me by phone or mail. You may also contact my advisor, Dr. Marilyn Amey, at the University of Kansas, 2 Bailey Hall, Lawrence, KS 66045, (913) 864-9724.

Sincerely,

Linda Knudson
Principal Investigator

Please sign your consent with full knowledge of the nature and purpose of the procedures, the benefits you may expect, and the minimal risk involved. I appreciate your assistance.

____
(Name)

With my signature, I acknowledge that I have received a copy of the Consent Form to keep.

APPENDIX A

CONSENT FORM - TEAM MEMBERS

Linda Knudson
8511 W. 98th Street
Overland Park, KS 66212

January 6, 1997

Dear (Name):

The Department of Educational Policy and Leadership at the University of Kansas supports the practice of protection for human subjects participating in research. The following information is provided for you to decide whether you wish to participate in the present study. You should be aware that even if you agree to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without penalty.

You are being asked to participate in a study conducted by Linda Knudson, a doctoral candidate at the University of Kansas. The study will focus on the president's leadership team in community colleges. I am interested in studying the effects of the president's leadership orientation and its relationship to how the leadership team functions. As part of this study, I would like to schedule an in-depth interview with you of approximately one and a half hours in length. With your permission, the interviews will be audio taped. You have the right to have the tape recorder turned off at any time you choose. You will be asked to discuss a variety of topics related to leadership, team leadership, and the effectiveness of the leadership team. It is not likely that participants will experience any risk or discomfort from the interviews. The information you provide will be analyzed in conjunction with the interviews of your president, the other team members, and the presidents and team members of two other community colleges, to identify themes and issues related to team leadership. I would also like to observe a meeting of your leadership team to gain additional perspective about how this team functions. Again, participation in the interview process and the team observation is voluntary.

All information gathered from this study will be kept confidential. Neither individuals nor their colleges will be identified by name in any materials emanating from this study. The contribution of this research to the understanding of presidential leadership teams in community colleges may be significant, as no similar study has of yet been conducted. In exchange for your assistance, I would be more than happy to provide you with a completed report.

If you would like additional information concerning this study before or after it is complete, please feel free to contact me by phone or mail. You may also contact my advisor, Dr. Marilyn Amey, at the University of Kansas, 2 Bailey Hall, Lawrence, KS 66045 (913) 864-9724.

Sincerely,

Linda Knudson, Principal Investigator

Please sign your consent with full knowledge of the nature and purpose of the procedures, the benefits you may expect, and the minimal risk involved. I appreciate your assistance.

____
(Name)

With my signature, I acknowledge that I have received a copy of the Consent Form to keep.

APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHIC FORMS

APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHIC FORM - INSTITUTION

Institution:____

Team Name:____

Number of Team Members:____________________

Number of College Employees:_________________

Fall 1996 Student Headcount:___________________

Community Population__________________

Service Area Population_________________

College Organizational Chart Received:_______

College Mission Statement Received:_________

APPENDIX B

TEAM MEMBER SURVEY

Name:____

Institution:______________________________________

Title:____

Age:____________ Gender:_________ Ethnicity:________

Highest Degree Earned:______________________

Number of Years at the College:________________

Number of Years in Current Position:_____________

Number of Years on the President's Leadership Team:__________

Number of Years in Higher Education:_______________

Position Description Received:__________

Resume Received:___________________

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL - PRESIDENTS

The purpose of this study is to identify how community college presidents build their leadership teams and work with them. I am defining the leadership team as the president's inner circle, or as the individuals with whom you work most closely.

1.0. What does the concept "leadership" mean to you? How do you define good presidential leadership?

2.0. What does the concept "team" mean to you? Who are the members of your leadership team? [Are there others with whom you work closely?] What would you say are the role and most important functions of a leadership team? In what ways do you find the leadership team to be most useful? Least useful?

2.1. How were these members selected? [Which ones did you personally select, and which ones did you inherit?] What role does _____________play on the leadership team? [Ask for all team members] What role do you play within the team?

2.2. Most leadership teams develop a pattern of behavior or a way of doing business. Sometimes this is referred to as the team's operating style. Could you describe the most important aspects of the leadership team's operating style here at ____________ community college?

2.3. How often does the team meet as a group and for what purposes? Tell me how the team's agenda is constructed.

2.4. How would you describe the quality of the communication within the team? How do you make sure that every voice is heard, even opposing ones?

2.5. How is conflict handled within the team? How do you feel about it? What gets in the way of effective teamwork?

2.6. What grade would you assess your teamwork on a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being the highest?

2.7. We have been talking about the idea of a leadership team. To what extent is this team really a team? What are your concerns about the way this team functions?

3.0. What advice would you give to a new community college president who has just hired his or her executive officers but who has not yet turned them into a team? That is, what do you think most contributed to the making of the leadership team here at ______________community college that other presidents might keep in mind in constructing their own teams?

4.0. I would like to learn a little more about how this team works by asking you to think of a recent, important issue that the team had to deal with. Could you tell me what it was about, and how the team handled it?

4.1. How did the team's performance compare with your expectations? What did you learn from the experience? [What would you have done differently?]

4.2. From your experience, what kinds of things should the members of a leadership team have in common? [Why?] How should members of the team differ from each other? [Why?]

4.3. If a newcomer to your leadership team were to ask you "What are the unwritten rules for the leadership team here at_____________community college, the unspoken things I really need to know to get along and to be effective in the team?" what would you say?

5.0. How would you describe your relationship with the team? Are there any sources of conflict or tension within the team? [How do you deal with them?]

5.1. How do you assess the overall effectiveness of the leadership team here at ______________community college?

6.0. What strategies are necessary to keep a leadership team functioning effectively over time?

7.0 Is there anything else you would like to tell me about your leadership team or your role within it?

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL - TEAM MEMBERS

The purpose of this study is to identify how the president's leadership team works in a community college setting. I am defining the leadership team as the president's inner circle. Your president has indicated that you are a member of the leadership team at____________ community college. You and the individuals with whom you work most closely will be interviewed to determine the team's role and function and your role on the team.

1.0. What does the concept "leadership" mean to you? How do you define good presidential leadership?

2.0. What does the concept "team" mean to you? What would you say are the role and most important functions of a leadership team? In what ways do you find the leadership team to be most useful? Least useful?

2.1. What role do you play on the leadership team? [Ask for all members.]

2.2. Most leadership teams develop a pattern of behavior or a way of doing business. Sometimes this is referred to as the team's operating style. Could you describe the most important aspects of the leadership team's operating style here at ____________ community college?

2.3. How often does the team meet as a group and for what purposes? Tell me how the team's agenda is constructed.

2.4. What makes your meetings important?

2.5. How would you describe the quality of the communication within the team? What does your president do to make sure that every voice is heard, even opposing ones?

2.6. How is conflict handled within the team? How do you feel about it? What gets in the way of effective teamwork? [How well do the members of your team get along?] [Are there any sources of conflict or tension within the team?] [How are they dealt with?]

2.7. What grade would you assess your teamwork on a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being the highest?

2.8. We have been talking about the idea of a leadership team. To what extent is this team really a team? What do you think most contributed to the making of the leadership team here at _______________community college? What are your concerns about how this team functions?

2.9. How would you describe your president as the team's leader?

2.10. What do you get personally from membership on this team?

3. 0. From your experience, what kinds of things should the members of a leadership team have in common? [Why?] How should members of the team differ from each other? [Why?]

3.1. If a newcomer to your leadership team were to ask you "What are the unwritten rules for the leadership team here at __________community college, the unspoken things I really need to know to get along and to be effective in the team?" what would you say?

4.0 I would like to learn a little more about how this team works by asking you to think of a recent, important issue that the team had to deal with. Could you tell me what it was about, and how the team handled it?

4.1. How did the team's performance compare with your expectations? What did you learn from the experience? [What would you have done differently?]

5.0. How do you assess the overall effectiveness of the leadership team here at _____________community college?

6.0 What strategies are necessary to keep a leadership team functioning effectively over time?

7.0 Is there anything else you would like to tell me about your leadership team or your role within it?

APPENDIX D

TEAM OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

APPENDIX D

TEAM OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

College:____

Date of Meeting:__________________________________

Duration of Meeting:______________________________

Team Members Present:

Agenda Items Dealt With:

Three Functions of Leadership Teams Observed:

Utilitarian - providing information, coordinating, planning, making decisions:

Expressive - mutual support, counsel to the president:

Cognitive - questioning, challenging, arguing, multiple perspectives, monitoring and feedback:

Core Cognitive Roles Observed:

Definer - voices a view of the team's reality:

Analyst - provides deep examination of the issues defined:

Interpreter - translates how people outside the team are likely to see the issues:

Critic - redefines, reanalyzes, or reinterprets the issues:

Synthesizer - facilitates a summation of the team's reality:

President's Cognitive Frame(s) Observed:

Bureaucratic - structure, organization, setting priorities, making decisions, communicating through established lines of authority, correcting actions:

Collegial - building consensus, team problem solving, loyalty and commitment to the college, leading by example:

Political - mediation, negotiation, influencing through persuasion and diplomacy, establishing relationships with constituencies, developing coalitions:

Symbolic - management of meaning, maintaining culture, manipulating symbols such as language, myths, stories and rituals to foster shared meaning and beliefs:

Team Interactions:

Lateral:

President to Team:

Observed Team Behaviors vs. Interview Descriptions:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX E

CODING SCHEMES

APPENDIX E

CODING SCHEME

Team Functional Domain

Code	Concept	Key Behaviors
utl	utilitarian	controlling, decision making, information giving, planning, coordinating
exp	expressive	supporting, counseling, socializing, connecting, communicating, feeling
cog	cognitive	creating, thinking, questioning, challenging, arguing, providing feedback, monitoring, talking, discovering, perceiving

Presidents' Cognitive Frame of Reference

Code	Concept	Key Behaviors
bur	bureaucratic	organizing, setting priorities, making orderly decisions, communicating via established lines of authority, exercising power and control
col	collegial	consensus building, problem solving, leading by example, demonstrating loyalty and commitment to the college, empowering, demonstrating equality
pol	political	monitoring the internal and external environments, influencing, establishing relationships, coalition building, compromising
smb	symbolic	emphasizing and reinforcing values, history, language, myths, stories, rituals, and culture; sharing meaning and belief

Team Core Cognitive Roles

Code	Concept	Key Behaviors
def	Definer	visioning, agenda building, idea generating, concept building
anl	Analyst	analyzing, seeing from different angles, exploring, projecting effects and impacts, seeing the core of the problem or the heart of the issue
int	Interpreter	providing historical perspective, figuring out how things fit with precedent, translating how outsiders will perceive the issues
crt	Critic	redefining, reanalyzing, reinterpreting, strategic thinking, asking radical questions like "why" and "what if"
syn	Synthesizer	eliciting viewpoint and ideas, drawing diverse ideas into a whole, facilitating a climate of tolerance, engaging participation

Team Supporting Cognitive Roles

Code	Concept	Key Behaviors
dm	Disparity Monitor	watching, listening, and monitoring how faculty, staff, students, trustees, and the community view the team's actions
tm	Task Monitor	picking up loose ends, removing obstacles, paying attention to processes, ordering priorities and actions, keeping the team on task
em	Emotional Monitor	supporting, listening, encouraging, empathizing, assisting in developing and maintaining relationships, using humor to monitor feelings